THE

CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

No. CXCI.] NOVEMBER, 1860. [Vol. XVI.

WILLIAM PALEY.*

Nothing can more decidedly shew the wide and lasting appreciation of an author than the republication of his works, by able men, sixty or seventy years after their first appearance, with notes, additions and corrections, designed to bring them up to the mark of our later knowledge. This office was performed nine or ten years ago by Lord Brougham in reference to Paley's *Natural Theology*, and has now been taken up by Archbishop Whately in the case of the *Evidences of Christianity* and the *Moral Philosophy*. The *Horæ Paulinæ* scarcely admits of correction, nor seems to require addition. The Archbishop of Dublin's notes, and the very able estimate of Paley in the new edition of the Encyclopædia Britannica (by Professor Henry Rogers), suggest to us the propriety of bringing Paley before the readers of the Christian Reformer.

His four chief works form, of themselves, as regards subject if not treatment, a complete cycle of theological and moral inquiry. They were not indeed written in the order in which they should be read by a student (in the reverse order, in fact), the Natural Theology being the last completed; but he himself regarded them, when thus completed, as a comprehensive system of religion and morality; and this co-relation among them has no doubt tended, on the one hand, to give currency to the least valuable through the high credit of the rest; and, on the other, to prejudice those who dislike certain parts of his works against the independent merits of other parts. We shall now notice his writings in their proper order as indicating a system or course of study, and endeavour to discriminate their by no means uniform worth; first transcribing Mr. Rogers's very able and just estimate of the author's characteristic abilities.

---

* Paley's Moral Philosophy. With Annotations by Richard Whately, D.D., Archbishop of Dublin. 1859.

Paley's Evidences. With Annotations by Richard Whately, D.D., Archbishop of Dublin. 1859.

Life of Paley. By G. W. Meadley. 1809.

Life of Paley. By Rev. Edmund Paley, his Son. (Prefixed to Works. 7 vols. 1825.)

Life of Paley, in Encyc. Brit., 8th Edition, 1860, Vol. XVII. (pp. 199—206).

"The mind of Paley was acute rather than profound—discriminating and observant rather than comprehensive. If we except the mathematics, he had little aptitude for abstract science; the complex, subtle fugitive phenomena of consciousness, he had neither analytic skill, nor, we suspect, patience thoroughly to investigate. In almost the only place in all his works—the first two books of his *Moral Philosophy*—where refined analysis of the phenomena of consciousness was specially demanded, he is generally admitted to have signally failed. When he approaches the confines of metaphysical discussion, we see how apt he is to resile from it; in part, doubtless, from want of congeniality with such subjects, but in part also from his predominant love of the *practical.* Indeed, from the strength of this last characteristic, he would probably still have been an indifferent metaphysician, even had his talents for abstract science been much greater than they were. As it was, the sense of the practical generally decided at once the limits within which he was disposed to speculate. But within his own province—and a very extensive and most important one it is—it may be doubted whether any mind was ever more happily equipped for its functions. In all questions that involve a practical issue and which stop short of the metaphysical principles of knowledge and belief; questions which men must and will and do decide independently of the *theories* of those principles; in all questions which involve the investigation and comparison of *facts,* and just *logical* deduction from them, his powers are of the very first order. Few ever surpassed him in the discovery of apt arguments for his purpose, in the ingenuity with which he could combine apparently inconsiderable and often neglected data, and make them yield unexpected conclusions—in the selection and arrangement of his materials—in the skill with which he wrought them into his truly original structures of argumentation—in the fecundity and felicity of his illustrations or the exquisite precision and transparency of his style; and hence, on all his works he has stamped the image of his own genius, though the subjects (with one exception) were already worn threadbare. In surveying his ground, in determining what points to assail or defend, and in marshalling his forces, he had, in military phrase, the general's eye. His works in their whole laying out and plan—in their adaptation of part to part—exhibit not simply strong powers of logic, but constructive genius of a very high order. His imagination and wit were both tolerably active; indeed, the latter is represented as exuberant in private life, and as making him the delight of the social circle; but in his writings both these qualities are so completely *ministerial,* that there is probably hardly a single instance in all his works where an illustration is introduced to embellish or delight, or to minister to the sense of beauty. All are either exemplifications of the argument itself *(instances)* or designed to give a more graphic and precise expression to it. His style is the just reflex of his mind. It is eminently precise and luminous, both as regards diction and construction; as he is never guilty of *overdoing* in argument, but contents himself with the proofs that most speedily establish the conclusion, and there stops, so it is in his style. The chief excellence of all strictly argumentative composition must of course be perspicuity; for what is called beauty of style (as regards the greater part of its elements), there cannot be much scope. Perspicuity of style, however, Paley possesses in such perfection, that its very luci-

dity becomes beauty. Probably no man besides ever expressed so much scientific matter as he has expressed in his *Natural Theology*, without technicalities, without pedantry, in such easy colloquial diction, with such apt and homely illustrations. It is science without the forms of it.

"This lucid simplicity has often led readers to undervalue Paley as a thinker; it not only produces the effect of a perfectly translucent medium, which the more clearly it lets us see objects the less it obtrudes itself upon us; it is like a pure stream which refracts the light so perfectly as always to seem to the eye more shallow than it is.

"There is a natural correspondence between the mental and moral characteristics of men; so it was with Paley. His intellect was neither profound nor subtle; and accordingly his sympathies were circumscribed. He was also without enthusiasm; and there was, in consequence, little elevation of sentiment and no vehemence of passion about him."

The above estimate of Paley's mind—to which Mr. Rogers adds a hearty and just tribute to the benevolence of his character and the cheerfulness of his disposition—explains the unequal value of his works. Their respective dates also attest the comparative crudeness of the least satisfactory and the maturity of the most so.

First in order for the student comes the *Natural Theology*, published in 1802, only three years before his death. It is in our opinion Paley's chief, as it is his maturest, work, and that on which his characteristic fame will always chiefly rest. The charge of want of originality directed against it, might as well be brought against Newton when he infers gravitation from the falling of an apple which anybody else could see, or Priestley when he discovers oxygen which everybody breathes. The originality is not in the things or the facts, but in the inferences drawn from them, the use made of them. As Mr. Rogers says:

"The merit of Paley's work is that of having wrought materials open to everybody into a beautiful fabric; and to blame him that his materials were got from other quarters, is much as if it were charged upon a great architect that his stone was not of his own quarrying, nor his bricks of his own burning. . . . . Considering the entire character of the man's intellect, it is about the last meanness of which we should suspect him."

Of the execution of this work, Mr. Rogers writes,—and we quite agree with his estimate, remembering our own youth when we read both novels and natural theology:

"Such is the skill with which the *Natural Theology* is planned and executed, such the felicitous selection and disposition of the materials, so apt are the examples and illustrations, so luminous the expression, that to a youth of intelligence few novels are more interesting. Paley's survey of the ground too, and the limits within which he resolved to construct, shew great logical sagacity. Clearly seeing that if the immensely varied and complicated 'adaptations' of the universe can be shewn to have originated in conscious intelligence, it will be difficult not to grant all the concessions which theism asks for; he avoids all the

darker, especially the so-called *a-priori* methods, though freely leaving any such methods open to those who choose to employ them or who can profit by them. He therefore bends his chief energies to exhibit the indications of *design* in the universe, and for this purpose nothing can be more judicious than his choice of examples."

It has been the fashion with some recent critics to find fault with Paley's argument from *design*. "Contrivance," "expedients," "mechanism," "compensation," "package," and all such terms, used by him to describe graphically the facts of animal or vegetable structure, and suggesting the idea of Mind as necessarily involved in their origination, are fastidiously regarded as degrading the Deity "into a Mechanic." It is easy to find fault with a writer's arguments if we begin with misrepresenting and burlesquing them. The reply, not only on behalf of Paley, but of all who have argued an intelligent Author from the marks of intelligent design in the creation, of course is,—

"That it is a mere misinterpretation of the obvious meaning of these writers. All they mean to assert is, that there must be power and intelligence in the Supreme Cause of all, proportioned to the production of the phenomena ascribed to him; just as there must be in man proportioned to the phenomena of *his* power and intelligence. But though in expressing this they necessarily use figurative language derived from the analogy of man's nature, they plainly do not intend to imply that the *modes* in which wisdom and intelligence on the part of God and man are respectively exerted or manifested are the same; or that what is *long sought*, laborious and successive in man's mind is at all so in God's. And as this is the meaning of these writers, and their sole meaning, so it may be doubted whether there ever was an atheist who really misunderstood it."

Among the suggested improvements of the Natural Theology argument, the one of highest pretensions is that ascribed to Kant, and (strange to say) popularized by two such opposite theologians as A. Coquerel* and Theodore Parker:† "The human mind has the idea of God; *therefore* God is." Otherwise, it is argued, there would be a faculty without a corresponding object. And why not? says the atheist. The argument can only be addressed to the theist, to prove to him the Divine existence from what he already believes of the Divine perfections! Never was such an obviously circular argument. The only difficulty is in thinking that it should ever have imposed on minds reputed logical. We cannot give up Paley's argument from design, to adopt any such tempting short-cut to theology as this. In reference to it and to other recent suggestions for a less argumentative theology, Mr. Rogers well says:

"Some theists complain that Paley does not take *other* methods—that he does not do *this*, that he does not do *that;* that he does not appeal to man's moral instincts, to his intuitive convictions of a Deity, sense of

* Christologie, chap. xv.

† Disc. of Religion, chap. ii.

the infinite, and so on; that he is busy rather about the 'means and machinery' by which the Deity works than the 'ends for which he works;' that he is more busy about the 'reasons of belief' than 'the object of faith;' with much more to the same purpose, or rather to no purpose; for surely the question ought to be, not what a theist can accept as a sufficient dissertation on the Divine existence and perfections, but what an atheist will find it most difficult to evade; nor, again, whether a theist may not prefer another line of argument for himself, but whether he can suggest any which an atheist will find it less difficult to understand and embrace; in other words, whether Paley does what he intends to do; and whether what he intends to do be, with *reference to those whom he addresses*, the best adapted to produce a conviction of the existence of a personal Intelligence that has constructed and presides over the universe. If man can be brought to admit his argument, that one admission will pave the way for every other involved in the ordinary theory of theism." . . . .

"Some say there is no better way in this controversy than that of appealing at once to a direct intuitive consciousness of an infinite God. But what if atheists deny that they have any such? What if they affirm that if there be any such voice within, it is by itself a whisper or inarticulate? What if the majority even of theists say that such whispers are confirmations when made distinct, but are not first head-grounds of conviction? What if they say that their convictions are so far dependent, at the very outset, on this question of the 'order' of the universe, that supposing confusion reigned in the natural world while the mind retained all its present powers (were that possible), they doubt whether any 'intuitions' they have would have satisfied them of the existence of a Deity, or even induced the faintest suspicion of one?"

The next of Paley's works (in the student's order) is the *Evidences of Christianity*. It was published in 1794, when the author was fifty-one years of age. This work is, of course, no more original in its historical facts than the *Natural Theology* in its scientific ones. But in the manner in which they are brought to bear upon his argument, there is the same strong individuality of thought as in the *Theology*. He continually acknowledges his obligations to Lardner, Douglass and others. In those parts which have to deal with testimony, we see the characteristic acuteness of a thoroughly *legal* mind, which had led the boy William Paley to act the Lancaster assizes over again among his schoolfellows at Giggleswick, and had carried the youth from the neighbourhood of Ripon to York to hear the trial of Eugene Aram, whom he afterwards described as "a man who has got himself hanged by his own cleverness" in his defence.

We have never thought the formal and ostensible distribution of Paley's *Evidences* either happy or remarkably lucid; but it is a strange mistake to charge it with omitting all reference to the *internal* evidences of Christianity. These are embraced under the "auxiliary evidences" in Part ii., and some of them are developed in a very striking manner. Paley's division of his subject is as follows:

Preparatory Considerations, especially the question of the Antecedent Credibility of Miracles.

Part i. The direct Historical Evidence of Christianity, and wherein it is distinguished from the Evidence alleged for other Miracles.

Part ii. The Auxiliary Evidences of Christianity, including the *internal.*

Part iii. Consideration of Objections.

So far the division is clear and intelligible; though some might prefer that of *external* and *internal* evidence, which would have embraced nearly the same topics as his first and second Parts respectively. But his direct historical evidence (forming Part i.) is made to look needlessly hard and formal and somewhat repulsive by the useless obtrusion, at the head of each chapter, of his "Proposition 1, That there is satisfactory evidence that many, professing to be original witnesses of the Christian miracles, passed their lives in labours, dangers and sufferings," &c.; or his "Proposition 2, That there is NOT satisfactory evidence" in regard to "other similar miracles." These two propositions are, we believe, fully proved by Paley; but we scarcely feel that this is the whole issue of the historical question, and it is impossible to pretend that each chapter as it occurs demonstrates afresh the again repeated proposition. They may all, directly or indirectly, bear upon it; but each of them leaves upon the mind a varied and a wider impression of the thing proved, and of the thing to be proved, than is expressed in that recurrent formula. This at least has been our own feeling from our earliest acquaintance with Paley's *Evidences*,—that he fully proves his first proposition respecting Christianity, but also proves a great deal more that is far more interesting and important to us as going to form our conception of Christianity and its evidences. This criticism, it is true, applies merely to the *form* of the book; but we admit that its form is in this respect unprepossessing, and by no means sufficiently describes the subject or its treatment. How fully Paley has illustrated his subject, and how little he has left to be added, we may judge from the Archbishop of Dublin's new edition of the book. A good Introduction vindicates the sufficiency of Paley's book for the argumentative position of the Christian evidences in our day:

"The truth is, that against the substance of Christianity itself, as distinguished from human perversions of it, modern infidelity—however it may boast of new discoveries—has nothing more to say than has been said and refuted a thousand times. It may seem to present a terrible form in the obscurity which German metaphysics have thrown round it; but upon a nearer view, the spectre will resolve itself into the old worn-out clothes of Collins, and Toland, and Chubb, and Hume, which are now too soiled and threadbare to be exhibited openly in the daylight." (Int. p. 2).

Whately has a salutary word for another class of persons who acknowledge the use and necessity of the study of Christian evidences, but "dislike and deplore that necessity," viewing the matter "somewhat as any person of humane disposition does the arming and training of soldiers." "All attention to the subject is connected in their minds with the idea of *doubt*, which they feel to be painful and dread as something sinful."

"Far different (he says) are men's feelings in reference to any person or thing that they really do greatly value and admire, when they have a full and firm conviction. No one in ordinary life considers it disagreeable to mark and dwell on the constantly recurring proofs of the excellent and admirable qualities of some highly valued friend."

"So also in what is called Natural Theology—the proofs of the wisdom, goodness and power of God—how delightful to a pious mind is the contemplation of the evidence which it presents!"

"It is not for the refutation of objectors merely, and for the conviction of doubters, that it is worth while to study in this manner, with the aid of such a guide as Paley, the two volumes—that of Nature and that of Revelation—which Providence has opened before us, but because it is both profitable and gratifying to a well-constituted mind to trace in each of them the evident handwriting of Him, the Divine Author of both."

We might be disappointed, except as feeling that it reflects credit upon our Paley, to find how little of real importance the Archbishop of Dublin has added in his "Annotations." Occasionally he defines a little more precisely some careless expression of Paley's; but he corrects or alters little, and adds less. We are amused to find him twice perplexing himself as to whether the Epistle of Barnabas was by "Barnabas the apostle" or by some other Barnabas (pp. 90 and 367), not having been aware ourselves that there was such an apostle, and having been content, with Paley, to speak of "Barnabas, the companion of Paul," as the author of the Epistle in question, and to regard it, with Paley, as "probably genuine." The good Archbishop suggests a whimsical argument (which we think Paley can do without) for the genuineness of the New Testament books, from there being in them "no liturgies, creeds or other formularies," which he thinks there would have been, had not "the apostles and their attendants been *super*naturally restrained from drawing up any such written records." We trust more to the natural than the *super*natural suggestion here. There is the fact that they did not draw up such creeds; and from this fact we are content to conclude that creeds are post-apostolical. But some of the Archbishop's observations are timely enough; as this, in connection with the revivalist and other pretensions:

"Thus it is that presumptuous and unwise Christians prepare the way for the inroads of that covert infidelity, which by making *every* thing miraculous, makes, in fact, *nothing* miraculous, and virtually destroys the whole character of inspiration by making it universal. A

king would be virtually dethroned, if all his subjects were elevated to regal power."—P. 201.

We must add Mr. Rogers's estimate of the undiminished value of Paley's Evidences:

"It is the fashion with infidelity now-a-days to speak of Paley's 'Evidences' as *passé;* as having little or no relation to present controversies; and as utterly inadequate to meet those more subtle and more efficient methods of refuting the truth of Christianity which modern astuteness has discovered. This is a stock fallacy with many infidel writers; and by mere repetition it has among the young and ignorant often passed current. We maintain, on the contrary, that the supposed new methods differ from the old more in form than substance; and that when they differ in form they do not affect the substance of the argument. Almost everything in the new methods that has any real bearing on the controversy has been long since propounded to the world. Nor, if we reflect, could it well be otherwise. An *asserted historic fact* is not like a Chinese puzzle capable of being put together in a thousand ways. Christianity professes to be *historically* true, and the only way it could be shewn *not* to be so is to shew that its alleged facts are no facts at all. Now the *mode* of doing this admits of no great choice; changes of form or detail there may be, but there can be little more." (Mr. Rogers illustrates this position in some detail.) "The infidel hypotheses as to the origin of Christianity are indeed various, and, unhappily for its opponents, very contradictory; but the arguments by which it is attempted to prove its unhistoric character are necessarily the same.

"Thus it is not easy to see that the *a-priori* argument for the incredibility of all external revelation, based on the modern 'spiritual deism,' differs essentially from Lord Herbert's old-fashioned argument founded on his natural deism; nor does it matter, though the one calls the responses of the internal oracle 'spiritual intuitions,' and the other 'innate ideas.' There is plenty of scope for a 'revelation,' as human nature is now constituted, in confirmation or rectification of either; for never, judging by results, was any oracle less oracular." . . . .

"Paley's work is still a sufficient answer to the generality of modern arguments against Christianity. Even Paulus and Strauss, so far as Christianity is really assailed by any argument which attempts to prove its unhistoric character, infuse the old methods; as for their own hypotheses, utterly contradictory by the way, for accounting for its origin in defiance of history, Paley of course never dreamt of them; nor is it a matter of much consequence, for they are just becoming (one of them has become) a by-word and laughing-stock in Germany itself. Not only are they so incoherent with each other, but they imply such a dreadful compression and torture of the understanding of any reasonable creature who attempts to believe that either does really give the rationale of the Christianity of the New Testament,—both so aggravate the difficulties of its origin, supposing it to be what they make it,—that there is not one man out of a thousand who would not sooner receive the entire New Testament, or reject it entire, than submit to the humiliation and bondage of such exegesis. It is often perfectly ludicrous, even as applied to single passages; but to go through the whole New Testament, reading plain narratives backwards or crosswise, or any way except the plain

way—dissolving facts into mistakes and myths—is beyond all human patience." (Mr. Rogers illustrates his case by taking the history of Paul's conversion and analyzing the rationalistic mode of accounting for it.)

There is one subject on which Paley's *Evidences* might with advantage be annotated up to the improved state of theological criticism, but which the Archbishop has left as he found it. We mean the fulfilment of the Old Testament prophecies in the events of the New. Paley introduces only one instance, and that the most striking, namely Isaiah lii. 13, liii. But he gives us to understand that there are many similar ones, and does not hint the nearer and more simply national applicability of the Messianic prophecies in general. This might be difficult ground for an Archbishop to tread, but it needs to be carefully trodden by any inquirer into the *Evidences*. Paley's argument from our Lord's prophecy of the destruction of Jerusalem needs no qualification or addition.

After the Evidences of Christianity, the *Horæ Paulinæ* is the next of Paley's volumes, in student's order, as teaching how to read the Scriptures intelligently. It appeared in 1790. It is no disparagement to the merits of this book that it has never attained the same *popularity* as his other writings. The Latin title on the back sends the mere English reader on to the next adjoining volume; or, if the book be opened and the explanatory addition be read on the title-page, "*Horæ Paulinæ*, or the Truth of the Scripture History of St. Paul evinced," still this is not attractive, nor even explanatory of the real nature and real charm of the book. The general reader thinks it is the investigation of some minute and insignificant theological points; and even the theologian does not guess what it really is till he has read in the first chapter the "Exposition of the Argument," or been directed (as is the general case) to its valuable and intensely interesting contents. All students know how to estimate its worth.

"The *Horæ Paulinæ* is the work of Paley which displays most originality. . . . . It is felicitous thought felicitously wrought out. There is indeed a pregnant passage of Doddridge in which he speaks of the reciprocal support which the undesigned coincidences between the Acts and the Epistles give to the historic credibility of both; and another still more general, in the *Pensées* of Pascal, hinting a similar thought in relation to the Gospels; but there is no proof that Paley saw either; while the extraordinary sagacity with which he has dragged latent coincidences from their hiding-places, and shewn correspondence where none before had suspected it, is all his own. If he had seen such hints, it would as little have abated his claims to originality as the striking passage from Origen, prefixed to the *Analogy*, detracts from Butler's. But it was honest, as Sir J. Mackintosh says, in Butler to place it there; and if Paley had really had his work suggested by the passage in Doddridge, one would hope that he would have done the like."

We come last to the first-written of Paley's chief works, his *Moral and Political Philosophy.* It is the least satisfactory of them to the largest number of theologians and moralists in the present day. Archbishop Whately's office in re-editing it has been chiefly to object and protest, and to correct his author's positions. That it has long been used, and still is, as a text-book at Cambridge, is the Archbishop's chief reason for annotating it. He says, "I am far from thinking that Paley's work ought not to be *one* of the text-books employed. But the study of it should be accompanied with cautions to the young student against adopting the whole of his system." He has oddly confined himself to the first volume, that is, to the first three books, which do not, however (as his Preface seems to imply), constitute the intire work on Moral Philosophy, and merely omit the Political; for they carry us only through the *Relative Duties,* and leave untouched the *Duties to Ourselves* (Book iv.), and *Duties towards God* (Book v.), as well as the *Elements of Political Knowledge* which form Book vi. A not over-candid critic on Paley and his annotator, in a book lately noticed by us,* suggests that the latter was anxious to avoid having to comment on Paley's doctrine of Establishments which is propounded in the latter half of his work. That "Dr. Whately appears to have annotated his author out of all credit" in what he has done to the Moral Philosophy, is true enough. But as the Archbishop has not shirked the chapter on Subscription to Articles, we cannot see how he should have been afraid of that on Establishments. He is quite Paleyan on the former, and might probably have shewn himself equally so on the latter. But he is far in advance in proposing to abolish oaths and make marriage a civil institution. He overturns Paley's ethical system itself to its very foundation; if it be not more correct to say, he shews that it is absolutely destitute of foundation. And we can only suppose he was tired of his task when half through the work of objecting.

No one, we think, can fail to be struck with the great inferiority of this work to all the rest of Paley's in precision of thought. The opening sentence, professedly containing a *definition* of the science, is eminently loose and unscientific, and we wonder how the Archbishop of Dublin could pass it by without castigation: "Moral Philosophy, Morality, Ethics, Casuistry, Natural Law, mean all the same thing; namely, *that science which teaches men their duty and the reasons of it.*" Pity that there are so many terms for the same thing! But is it so? Is not moral philosophy the *science* of duty, and morality the *practice,* and ethics (or morals) *sometimes the science and sometimes the practice;* and is not casuistry a very small *part of the science* (namely, that of difficult and doubtful cases); and is not natural

* The Ultimate Principle of Religious Liberty. 1860.

law *one part of the foundation* of both science and practice, in *contradistinction* to revealed law, which is another part? We do not here affect the precision of definition, but have marked at once half-a-dozen distinctions in the meanings of the terms called synonymous by Paley. Then in his third paragraph he says, "The rules of life by which men are ordinarily governed" are, "the law of honour, the law of the land and the Scriptures." Where the Scriptures are unknown, then, is there no rule of life but honour and the law of the land? Is there no such thing as conscience? In his chapter on the Moral Sense, Paley distinctly says *there is not;* though at the end of his fourth chapter he had said that "the Scriptures commonly presuppose in the persons to whom they speak, a knowledge of the principles of natural justice; and are employed not so much to teach *new* rules of morality, as to enforce the practice of it by *new* sanctions and by a *greater certainty*." His denial of the existence of the moral sense as a faculty of the human being, is quite inconsistent with such a passage as the above, and with the consciousness of most persons who reason on their own spiritual constitution. But there is no denying that Paley's philosophy really endeavours to do without admitting a *moral sense*. Those who would vindicate him against himself may think he has said more than he meant; that he only meant to deny its absoluteness of instinct; that from its endless varieties and contradictions, he was led to repudiate such a doctrine of conscience as would make it an absolute, complete and infallible instinct. Against this kind of doctrine of conscience Paley *does* level his arguments; but in its place he certainly says there is no moral faculty at all, while yet he assumes one in such passages as that just quoted about the Scriptures presupposing a knowledge of natural justice. Upon this dilemma his annotator fixes him often enough. It is indeed conceivable that Paley meant no more than to deny that the moral faculty is a distinct and separate faculty from the other intellectual and emotional powers. If so, who shall assure us that it is separate? Why do we need a separate faculty for judging of right and wrong, from that which judges of all other relations and distinctions? No doubt the idea or sentiment of right and wrong is perfectly distinct from and unlike all other ideas and sentiments. But so is the idea of number distinct from and unlike that of colour; the ideas of space, causation, time, &c., are utterly unlike each other; and the sentiments and passions, again, are various and different enough from each other; yet we do not maintain (unless we be craniologists) that there is a separate faculty for each class of ideas and sentiments. No more need there be a *separate* intellect or sensibility for the conscience, which is the common intellect and sensibility applied to questions of right and wrong. If Paley meant this, however, he ought to have said it, and both his followers and opponents would have understood him

better. We are disposed to think he meant something of this kind (though he could hardly have a clear meaning when using such loose phraseology), rather than that he really and distinctly meant to deny the existence of a faculty capable of the sentiment of moral right and wrong.

Equally unsatisfactory are his definitions of Virtue as "*the doing good to mankind, in obedience to the will of God and for the sake of everlasting happiness;*"* and of Obligation as "*a violent motive resulting from the command of another;*" and his distinction between Prudence and Duty, "*that in the one case we consider what we shall gain or lose in the present world: in the other case we consider what we shall gain or lose in the world to come.*" Such definitions are a libel even upon the utilitarian system of morals, of which Paley is often regarded as a leading expounder.

We account for the inferiority of the *Moral Philosophy* to Paley's other productions, not merely by the subject being one for which his mind was less fitted, but also by the very early period of his life to which the book may virtually be assigned. When he was only twenty-seven years old, he became one of the tutors of Christ's College, in which capacity "he lectured on metaphysics, morals and the Greek Testament." Here was the embryo of his Moral and Political Philosophy. This occupation continued for nine years, giving opportunity certainly for the frequent review and gradual modification, or even the renouncement of his earliest system of ethics, if the lecturer's mind had found *its real strength* in the direction of these studies. But such repetition may, *under opposite conditions*, tend merely to stereotype the first edition of a man's thoughts. And this we suppose to have been the case with Paley's *Moral Philosophy*, which was taught by him orally from his twenty-eighth year, and though not published till 1785 (his forty-second year), yet was published, we believe, at that time, with little or no improvement derived from deeper or maturer thought.

The *practical* character of Paley's mind seems, almost consciously, to have narrowed his field of view as a philosophical moralist. He says in his preface: "In pursuing the principle of morals through the detail of cases to which it is applicable, I have had in view to *accommodate* [the emphasis is ours] both the choice of the subjects and the manner of handling them to the situations which arise in the life of an inhabitant of this country in these times." To *apply* great principles to our national and local circumstances would be an important part of *political* philosophy; but the *moral* would stand a great chance of being narrowed and lowered by keeping such a purpose in view. Paley's system is certainly very *accommodating*.

* This definition was adopted from his patron the Bishop of Carlisle. (Meadley, p. 79.)

The considerations above suggested enable us—and we suggest them principally with that view—to retain our confidence in Paley's best and maturest works, for which his *acuteness* of mind peculiarly fitted him, though disavowing altogether his worst, most crude and ill-digested work, for the subject of which he wanted *depth of reasoning power and moral perception.*

To the embryo period of his Moral Philosophy belongs his famous (or infamous) *mot,* that "he could not afford to keep a conscience." The following is Mr. Meadley's account of it:

"The great controversy on the propriety of requiring a subscription to articles of faith, as practised by the Church of England, excited at this time a very strong sensation amongst the members of the two Universities. At Oxford, the principles of the High-Church party were completely triumphant, scarcely one opposing whisper being heard. But at Cambridge, the discussion exercised talents and ingenuity on both sides of the question, attended with no small asperity. Mr. Paley, though personally attached to many of the reforming party, and from the known liberality of his sentiments considered favourable to their claims, *did not sign* the clerical petition for relief which was presented to the House of Commons in 1772, alleging jocularly to Mr. Jebb, as an apology for his refusal, that 'he could not afford to keep a conscience.'"

The joke, we have always felt, was sober earnest. *Ridentem dicere verum, quid vetat?* Mr. Rogers makes no better of the matter for Paley's credit by saying in effect that the conscience he kept was of a very obtuse and low order:

"He *did* keep a conscience; but it is impossible to help feeling that a want of due sensitiveness, a certain moral laxity on some occasions, was the consistent fruit of a moral theory which necessarily turns the thoughts too closely on the 'profit and loss,' the advantages and disadvantages of actions, and invites to a too solicitous casuistry whenever it is not absolutely shameless to exercise it."

Paley was, in fact, a "Broad Churchman" by anticipation, differing from other Broad Churchmen of his day by *not* desiring relief from subscription. Another anecdote is characteristic. In 1662 (his twentieth year), when he had proposed to defend two theses, the one *against capital punishments,* the other *against the eternity of hell torments,* Dr. Thomas, the head of his College, "objected in strong terms to both his questions, but insisted upon his relinquishing the last. Mr. Paley immediately went to the moderator and acquainted him with this peremptory command. Mr. Watson was indignant that 'the heads of Colleges should interfere in a matter which belonged solely (as he said) to him; for he was the judge of the propriety or impropriety of the questions sent to him.' 'Are you, Sir (continued he) independent of your College? If you are, these shall be the questions for your *act.*' Mr. Paley told him that 'he should be sorry to offend the College, and therefore wished to change the last question.' 'Very well (replied the moderator); the best

way then to satisfy the scruples of these gentlemen will be for you to defend the eternity of hell torments;' *which, changing his thesis to the affirmative, he actually did.*" (Meadley, p. 19.) As on this occasion he was ready to take either side of the question, so on the question of subscription to articles he actually did take both sides in turn. His plea for lax subscription is well known. It stands in his Moral Philosophy as he taught it in his College lectures; and consistently with it he refused to sign a petition for relief. But the Bishop of Carlisle having published his "Considerations on the Propriety of requiring Subscription" (in favour of its abolition), and Dr. Randolph having "answered" the Considerations, Paley, in 1774, published a *Defence of the Considerations*, in which he virtually answers all his own arguments for lax subscription, and urges the need of relaxation for the sake alike of honour and intellect. This "Defence" of the Bishop's "Considerations" was published anonymously, and though ascribed by many to Paley, was more generously denied by others to be his; but his son states in a note (Life, p. 73) that he has now by him authority enough to say decidedly that this pamphlet *was* the production of Mr. Paley. The son does not seem to perceive the moral inconsistency here involved; but represents him as engaging in the controversy "so far as to answer an attack made on Bishop Law, his friend's father;" speaks of it as "a young performance, which was not made the vehicle for grave opinion, and which reflects more on the tone of his opponent than conveys any additional information or sentiment;" and stands by his father on the "chapter on Subscription," which, at least in substance, "he was using in his lectures at the very time." Could inconsistency be more sharply pointed out? What does a true moral sense—if, in spite of Paley's denial, there be such a thing among men—pronounce upon this case?

We conclude this too long article with judgments worth weighing.

Mr. Meadley, no uncandid biographer, says:

"Mr. Paley's casuistry in this instance, on the nature and extent of the obligation incurred, may be most effectually answered by his own better reasoning on the propriety of subscription, in his *Defence of Bishop Law's Considerations*, and in his chapter *Of Religious Establishments and of Toleration.*"

Mr. Meadley quotes a letter of Mrs. Jebb's, in which she says:

"Dr. Jebb, who, after he left the University, still retained his respect and friendship for him, and myself were both sorry that he did not express himself so strongly in his *Moral Philosophy* against subscription to the Articles, as from his real principles we might have expected."

Dr. Disney, in a note to Jebb's works (quoted also by Meadley), says of those opposite publications:

"In the *one case* he seems to betray the yoke of bondage, in the display of a very feeble apology; in the *other* he resumes somewhat more of his Christian liberty, and recollects the principles of his Protestant faith."

And what said Gilbert Wakefield?—"this Dissenting Wakefield," as Paley the son names him, without feeling that Dissent was Wakefield's practical self-sacrifice to his "Considerations on Subscription," and sneering at his "very equivocal bashfulness exhibited so boldly and intemperately." Gilbert Wakefield, nearly contemporary with Paley, who estimated the Moral Philosophy more highly than we do as an excellent summary, "notwithstanding some weak and some erroneous principles," speaks the natural sentiments of high honour which his own life from Cambridge to Dorchester gaol illustrated:

"I blush for him, I blush for this degradation of my species, when I see a man like *Dr. Paley*, of great worth and talents, and whose sentiments, from their general diffusion, must be so important to society—when I see that author stain the pages of his incomparable book with such a shuffling chapter on *Subscription to Articles of Religion*. He has amply gratified the most sanguine expectations of his friends, by the extraordinary powers of his penetrating and comprehensive understanding, and the glory of his *academical career*. But has he, in this instance, acted up to the general simplicity and honesty of his character?" (Wakefield's Memoirs, I. 129.)

Was it intemperate of Gilbert Wakefield to quote Joseph Mede's saying: "*There is more goes to persuasion than reasons or demonstrations, and that is not in my power*"?

SCRIPTURAL HYMN. By SIR JOHN BOWRING.

(Psalm cxix. 54.)

The sweetest song that music brings
When harmony is blent with awe,
Is that, all-loving God! which sings
Thy statutes, Thy benignant law.

What sweeter songs could e'er engage
The silent thought, the uttering voice,
Or fill life's passing pilgrimage
With lovelier light or holier joys?

These songs, when sanctified by Thee,
Are echoes from heaven's harps above,
Foretastes of immortality,
Dawns of celestial light and love.

The song which to divinest things
The captivated spirit draws,
Is that, all-loving God! which sings
Thy statutes, Thy benignant laws.

GEORGE HARRIS: A MEMOIR.

Chapter VI.

THE SCOTCH MISSION.

A map of Scotland conveys the only true representation of the field of Mr. Harris's Scotch missionary operations. They were spread over the whole length and breadth of the land. It may be said, in general terms, that wherever throughout the country any marked activity existed, he found materials on which he worked. Cities and villages, places of manufacturing industry and of scholastic repute, were alike invaded by him. It mattered not whether his audiences were great or small, or his adherents rich or poor, he was always ready to adapt himself to the varied circumstances under which his cause might be promoted. It mattered not how far he had to travel or what difficulties he had to encounter, where his presence was needed he would be sure to appear at the fitting time, uplifting his testimony. The stronger the opposition offered to him, the greater was his inducement to discharge the duty he had the opportunity to perform. "The efforts I have made," he said on one occasion in Glasgow, "were prompted by the feeling that, placed in the situation I deem it my high privilege to occupy, I was not merely the minister of this individual society, but bound, by obligations the most sacred, to consider myself the advocate of despised and unpopular truth, wherever and whenever an opening could be found to declare the right and expose the wrong." Sometimes his efforts were called forth by the fact, that in the localities he visited there were individuals who sympathized more or less with his opinions; and at other times he was led to these localities by hearing of virulent attacks upon his opinions which were there made. The kindly invitation of the friend, and the fierce denunciation of the foe, however different might be the feelings they excited, were met by him with an equal sense of obligation.

It was his custom, whenever possible, to connect his public ministrations with a celebration of the Lord's Supper, and also to unite together in a worshiping society those who were willing to make public profession of the Unitarian faith. He thus carefully attended to the distinctively religious interests of the persons who might be attracted by his theological expositions, and provided for the permanent establishment and growth of the influence he originated. He considered himself the pastor of each community which he thus formed, and was so considered by its members. He drew up its rules, watched over its interests, supplied its wants, conducted its business, and was personally acquainted with all the individuals composing it, as though he lived on the spot. Even when another minister took charge of any of these stations, he, as a matter of course, retained the over-

sight of the work. He was justly entitled to the appellation of "Unitarian Bishop" by which he was not unfrequently called. The honour in which he was held by all the professors of liberal Christianity in Scotland was singularly great. No one else was or could be compared with him. He stood alone in an estimation which one has well expressed by saying, "All the brethren all but worshiped him." "Up to this hour," says another, "the very mention of his name refreshes me." The contrast between the fear and hatred with which he was regarded by one class of the population and the enthusiastic admiration which was felt toward him by another was very striking, and truly descriptive both of the man and his position.

In order to promote the interest of this missionary work, he re-established the Scotch Unitarian Association. This occurred in July, 1830. We have seen that he was one of the main instruments in originating this institution so early as 1813. Since 1824, its operations had been discontinued; but new opportunities uniting with new zeal to require its agency, it was called again into use. The vigour with which it started afresh on its course was greater than it had ever before displayed, and it continued to increase in efficiency from year to year. The annual meetings of this body attracted the professors of Unitarianism from all parts of the land, and gave impulse to every effort that could be made by them for their common cause. When they who thus assembled together saw each other, they "thanked God and took courage." In reading the reports of these meetings, I have been deeply impressed with the substantial value of the matter brought forward at them from year to year. Great pains were taken to render them as effective as possible, and some of their transactions will remain among the most memorable manifestations of the Unitarian community.

During some portion of its continuance, this Association employed a missionary agent, whose business it was to travel from station to station sustaining the interests which had been created, and to break up fresh ground wherever possible. The Rev. Henry Clarke filled this situation from March, 1832, to November, 1834. Mr. Clarke's incessant labour and indomitable perseverance in the work he undertook demand a special notice. Taking Glasgow as the centre of his circuit, his preaching places varied from eight to fifty miles in distance, and his journeys to these places were almost always performed on foot. He had previously acted as a missionary in Lancashire, and was exceedingly well adapted for that kind of service. He was afterwards settled as the minister of Dundee, and from thence removed to Chorley.

At the time of the re-establishment of the Association, the only places in Scotland which had Unitarian ministers settled in them were Edinburgh and Glasgow; but whilst it was in opera-

tion, such settlements were effected in Dundee, Greenock, Aberdeen, Paisley and Tillicoultry. An attempt was made in 1837 to establish a second Unitarian congregation in Glasgow, under the ministry of the Rev. R. Jackson, who had given up the charge of an Independent Relief congregation in that city on account of a renunciation of orthodox opinions; but though the enterprize commenced under the most favourable auspices, it was not eventually successful. The ministers in all these places acted as missionaries, and in addition to them a considerable number of individuals were engaged in the same work, partly consisting of laymen who thus supplemented their ordinary employments, and partly of students in the Glasgow University who were preparing for the ministry. I am not able to construct a complete list of the persons who thus co-operated with Mr. Harris from time to time; but it is only due to those whose names have come prominently before me that I should mention them as they occur to my recollection. In this honourable band, then, were to be found B. T. Stannus, R. E. B. Maclellan, A. Macdonald, H. Giles, J. Cropper, J. Hope, W. M'Kean, G. H. Wells, D. Lloyd, C. Wicksteed, W. A. Jones, H. Clarke, James Forrest, T. Cooper, D. G. Coghill, C. Dunlop, T. Bradshaw, P. Callender and M. Scott.

Mr. Harris, as Secretary of the Association, conducted a correspondence with societies or individuals representing about sixty towns and villages in which the Unitarian element existed in more or less efficiency; and, besides undergoing the labour of this correspondence, the Christian Pioneer, already alluded to, was issued by him every month, involving in itself an amount of labour which might be thought sufficient to task all the literary energy which one in his circumstances could have at command. It would be unfair to judge this publication by any other standard than that supplied by the wants of the mission whose organ it was; and judged by that standard, a high commendation must be given to it. It gave all the information that was required; it grappled with every difficulty that turned up; and it offered the exhortations and encouragements which were calculated to keep up to the highest pitch the zeal of those among whom it circulated.

To exhibit more fully the character of this missionary work in which Mr. Harris was engaged, I will give a brief account of one or two of the adventures into which it led him.

Carluke is a town in Lanarkshire a few miles distant from Lanark itself, whose inhabitants, at the time I have to refer to, were employed in weaving stockings and cotton goods. As early as 1826, Mr. Harris delivered lectures there, and in October of that year an Unitarian society was formed in the place. Near Carluke, on a wild and comparatively uninhabited spot, called Davies-Dikes Moor, stood an old meeting-house, probably the

first erected on this side of the Forth by persons connected with that Secession from the Kirk, which was headed by the Erskines and took place in the first half of the last century. It was nearly equidistant from numerous towns and villages, but it had been for some time deserted on account of the erection of another Secession place of worship in a more populous part of the district. The chapel and the locality in which it stood were, however, considered sacred by reason of the assertion of religious liberty with which, as understood by the Secessionists, they were associated. Though the theology by which this Secession was characterized was very widely different from that of Unitarianism, the liberty of thought handed down in connection with it prepared the way in this, and in some other instances besides, both for a change of doctrinal opinion and a profession of the change when experienced. It is not only true that Unitarianism and religious freedom are very closely allied, but that a sympathy with freedom is more favourable to Unitarian interests than a mere agreement of doctrine is. Such agreement is indeed but of little effect where ecclesiastical submission is regarded with indifference. It was resolved by the Carluke congregation that if possible they would hold a Sunday service in a little glen upon the moor, which was close to the old meeting-house. Mr. Harris was asked to conduct the worship on the occasion, and he did so, Sunday, June 10, 1827, preaching two sermons, that were afterwards combined in one for publication and issued under the title of *The Progress of Reformation.* The sermons contained a powerful appeal in favour of carrying out to its legitimate theological extent the liberty to whose bold assertion, in times gone by, the place was consecrated. A large congregation was assembled; the Carluke congregation being joined by friends from Glasgow, Airdrie, Kirk of Shotts, Orbiston, Holytown, Hamilton, Lanark, Wishawtown, &c. The day was delightful, and the influence exerted by the preacher and the scene such as was never likely to be forgotten by those who witnessed it. A gentleman who was present at this celebration thus describes the part he took in it: "I was first introduced to Mr. Harris the day before the Davies-Dykes-Moor sermon was preached. I was going to drive in that direction, and I took him with me from Glasgow. The service was a most gratifying display. He preached in a circular hollow, and we all sat upon the grass. You will have read the sermon. I think nothing could have been better chosen—more suitable and telling—for the place and occasion. He certainly was the right man to address a mixed audience. He had the taste and ability to produce what was most effective, and, though sometimes fierce enough, was seldom otherwise than happy." The text was the 35th chapter of Isaiah, and it is worthy of being referred to by the reader for its beautiful aptitude. The Carluke congregation was principally kept up by local lay agency,

and was very frequently visited by Mr. Harris during the whole of his residence in Scotland.

Tillicoultry, in Clackmananshire, the seat of a considerable woollen manufactory, was a place to which Mr. Harris very often directed his efforts, and which was at length regularly supplied by him with preaching. One circumstance, at least, marks his labour there with special interest. He seems first to have preached in the village in 1829. Previously to his doing so, an application made on his behalf for the use of a school-room built by general subscription, was rejected at a meeting of the subscribers. The most active opponent of the application was the Rev. Archibald Browning, a Secession minister and schoolmaster in Tillicoultry. He declared that, though an advocate for free inquiry and willing to grant the use of the room to all other classes of religionists, he must specially except Unitarians from the liberty of worshiping in it. Ten years afterwards, Mr. Browning prevented a hall in Tillicoultry which was his property from being occupied by Mr. Harris, stating that when he built it he had mentally resolved that there were three purposes it should not be let for, — drinking, dancing, and Unitarian preaching. Shortly afterwards, however, he was destined to meet Mr. Harris face to face on occasion of the delivery by the latter of his lectures on Capital Punishment. This personal contact changed the current of feeling under which the opposition to Unitarianism had been offered, and a vote of thanks to the heretical champion was with marked cordiality proposed by his resolute antagonist. Time went on, and it came to pass, strangely enough, that, mainly under Mr. Harris's influence, Mr. Browning himself became a convert to Unitarianism. He ceased to be a Secession minister, but continued to preach to his old congregation, a large portion of whom still adhered to him. They did not, however, call themselves Unitarians, though their pastor was never reluctant to shew his sympathy with professed Unitarian objects. It was a strong proof of this that he admitted into his own pulpit the man whom he had endeavoured to deprive of any hearing at all. It manifested, indeed, a noble disposition on his part to brave public odium in thus making amends for the injustice he had formerly done. As Mr. Harris stood there, proclaiming doctrines from the very citadel of hostility, for attempting to introduce which into the place he had formerly been hooted and threatened with personal violence, he could not but deeply feel that a great victory had been gained. Well might he say in after years, "I am a little proud of that convert."

It was my happiness to make the acquaintance of Mr. Browning while I resided in Edinburgh. He was a man of strong sense and ardent temperament, devotedly attached to freedom in all its applications, and possessed of much talent for popular

address. In all that bore upon the defence and spread of liberal theology he took an enthusiastic interest. Within his own church "he spake as he believed" openly and boldly; but great bodily infirmity confined him almost entirely to the place where he lived. Had he been able to extend the sphere of his labour beyond this immediate locality, he would, I am convinced, have been eminently useful to the cause of Unitarian Christianity in Scotland. He once occupied my pulpit during a whole Sunday, and gave clear utterance to his altered faith. It was at great personal inconvenience that he did so; but he was desirous, at any risk, to leave behind him that testimony to his real position in the religious world. I believe this was the only time at which he appeared before a congregation formally designated Unitarian. He died on the 6th of February, 1858.

The history of the attempt to introduce Unitarianism into Stirling and its neighbourhood is full of warlike incidents. Occasional preaching in the guildhall had been permitted for a considerable time, and had met with evident success, when the Town Council interfered in the matter. The hall had been let as usual for a service by Mr. Harris, fixed for December 17th, 1839, when the Provost moved a resolution in the council meeting on the previous day, to the effect that the liberty so to employ it should be withdrawn. This motion was met by an amendment, that the hall should be granted for the next night in accordance with the agreement entered into, but should for the future be refused. The debate on this question was a curious specimen of civic wisdom. The Rev. Mr. Beith, who acted as spiritual adviser on the occasion, said, "he respected civil and religious liberty as much as any man possibly could; but it was of that religion which was based on the Saviour of men, not of that which denied the divinity of Christ." Baillie Smith "was not inclined to deal with his fellow-creatures in that way. He was not disposed to give particular countenance to Socinianism. He thought, for his part, there was little difference between them and others." Baillie Rankin thought that "the result of any interference on the part of the council would be, that a hue and cry would be raised through the town, and a great deal more mischief would be done thereby than was at all likely to ensue from the granting of the hall." The amendment was carried by a majority of three, eleven voting for and eight against it. Baillie Rankin's mournful prediction came of course to pass. A hue and cry was raised. Mr. Harris's ministrations, which were transferred to another hall, became more popular than ever; and a pamphlet he published, entitled, *Christian Unitarianism, what it is and what it is not—an Appeal to the serious and candid Inhabitants of Stirling*, had a very large circulation in the town. The motto of this pamphlet was a very pithy statement of the lesson which the local dignitaries who

had meddled with matters too high for them were forced to learn: "The subject part of mankind, in most places, might with Egyptian bondage expect Egyptian darkness too, were not the candle of the Lord set up by himself in men's minds, which it is impossible for the breath or power of man wholly to extinguish."—John Locke.

How strange it was that, in 1847, the Stirling burghs, of all the constituencies in Scotland, should have returned an Unitarian as their representative to Parliament in the person of J. B. Smith, Esq.! He was only returned after a very severe contest, and the battle at the last came to be fought on the ground of his religious opinions. In the thick of the fight the Stirling liberals remembered the man who had sustained among them the same cause as theirs in past years, and applied for assistance to Mr. Harris. He was then living in Newcastle-upon-Tyne. In a few days they received from him an address which, published anonymously, did most effective service on the side of Freedom. It was, in truth, as well composed as it was well timed, putting the case with irresistible clearness and strength; and it ranks among Mr. Harris's best productions. It was to him a renewal of his manhood in all its best strength to be thus called again into the field where he had before acquitted himself like a man.

Nearly a year after the Town Council interference, on Monday evening, October 19, 1840, Mr. Harris was to have preached in Stirling; "but every place was shut against the Unitarians, and for a season bigotry was triumphant in the royal burgh. Application was then made at St. Ninians, distant about a mile from Stirling; and one of the Unitarian friends being president of a subscription school in that place, obtained the sanction of the committee and the schoolmaster for the use of the room for that evening. Placards were accordingly issued announcing the preaching. Instantly the clergy, Established and Dissenting, became alarmed, the parents of the children were called upon and frightened, and the schoolmaster at their instigation refused the school-room and removed the forms. The preses, determined to resist the bigotry, obtained the keys and took possession also, replacing the seats. On reaching St. Ninians, Mr. Harris found considerable excitement had been occasioned, and that numbers of persons of all ages were assembled in the streets to offer every annoyance. The schoolmaster was insolent and threatened all manner of evil, should Mr. Harris attempt to preach. The hooting on his ascending the steps to the school-room was loud and continuous. Having entered the pulpit, Mr. Harris addressed the auditory, detailing the circumstances which had occurred, exposing the Protestant Popery which characterized the proceedings, appealing to their sense of justice and of right in the matter, but under the circumstances declining to preach, preferring to suffer wrong and to hold his peace when bigotry was rampant, at the same time

expressing his conviction that when the people returned to their right mind and really understood the meaning of Protestantism and Christianity, they would invite him to come amongst them, that this stain on their profession of the religion of liberty and love might be effaced. Immediately an individual—a stocking-weaver—stepped forward and proffered his cottage for the preaching. It was not many hundred yards off, and he should rejoice to open his door to shew his hatred of intolerance. The offer was accepted, and Mr. Harris preached to as many people as could possibly be crowded into two rooms and the entrance of the humble dwelling of this morally courageous individual. The preacher had scarcely reached Stirling after these occurrences, when a deputation called from Bannockburn to state that, having heard of the treatment he had experienced in the school-room at St. Ninians, a meeting had been held there on the instant, and the large subscription hall in the village was resolved to be placed at his disposal any night in the week, or on any future occasion. Mr. Harris afterwards preached at Bannockburn and also in Stirling, the trades hall having been engaged by his friends for twelve months for occasional meetings."

I must, however, bring this enumeration of occurrences having some interest special to themselves which marked Mr. Harris's missionary course, to a hasty conclusion. That course lay through sunshine and through shade, and its trials and triumphs were sometimes strangely balanced. If, as was literally the case in Kirkintilloch, an infuriated bigot in his sermon "doomed all Unitarians, with all who went to hear them, to hell," this more bitter hostility was sure to turn out, as it did there, to the furtherance of the misrepresented cause. If, as in the instance of Aberdeen, an amount of popularity was instantly secured that cannot be called other than wonderful, the success, as it did there, was sure to impose an amount of care and toil, the patient and energetic endurance of which was no less wonderful. Many were the instances in which human nature was too strong for the utmost virulence of theological wrath. At Dunfermline, a crowd had assembled to annoy the preacher, and a woman in it had actually furnished herself with a stone to fling at him; but on his being pointed out to her in order that she might accomplish her purpose, she suddenly dropped the stone, exclaiming, "Sic a wise-like man! Eh! what a pity he's a Unitarian!"—attaching probably to the name Unitarian, by which she had heard him called, a sense similar to that of wild beast. The honest conviction of religious duty from which Mr. Harris acted not only led him to tread the difficult path that thus lay before him undeterred by its dangers and continuously faithful to its responsibilities, but enabled him to find in the work itself a sufficient stimulus and an ample reward.

What was the effect of this strenuous and persevering mission-

ary labour, continued as it was without intermission for twenty years in Scotland? It is difficult to answer that question so as to approach the full truth, or to satisfy one's-self as to the pertinence of the answer that may be given.

Certainly the effect as to visible organization does not seem to be proportioned to the labour. In many of the places where Unitarianism bid fair to establish itself, it has no acknowledged existence; and in others the state in which it exists is apparently less flourishing than it was during the period to which we have been directing our attention.

In looking for the causes of this decline, we cannot but immediately perceive that a very large part of the previous success was dependent upon Mr. Harris's personal influence alone. It was distinctively a success which arose from his peculiar qualifications and attractions. When they were withdrawn, what was thus entirely caused by them ceased. To say this, is not to disparage the character of what was done, but to suggest that the actual result of it is to be looked for in another direction different from that of church development. It may, moreover, be conceded that Mr. Harris spread his force over too wide a field for permanent occupation. It has been thought that if he had concentrated his energies upon a few spots near at hand, greater fruit would have remained. I am not by any means convinced of this; but I am willing to grant its probability, with the understanding that, if it should appear that more powerful causes of failure made this but of comparatively little account, it must be allowed that it might have been, even on a knowledge of the whole history of the case, wiser to secure the greatest amount of that kind of effect which was undoubtedly within reach, ephemeral as it was.

Such insuperable causes there were. I do not reckon the orthodox prejudice of the people to be one of them, for I believe that might have been overcome. What I attach most importance to is the inadequacy of the means which Mr. Harris had at command for retaining the advantages he gained against the efforts of a resident and active clergy. In every parish in Scotland, one or more, and in some a large staff of men were to be found, whose office it was to resist such endeavours as he made. They were generally speaking zealous in the discharge of that office, and their constant presence with the people put instrumentalities into their hands which a stranger could not employ. The Scotch clergy, it should also be borne in mind, are much superior to the English clergy in their aptitude for meeting and repelling an heretical attack, and have much stronger support in the theological acquirements and tendencies of the people. Nothing will do the work of liberal evangelization which might and ought to be done, but such an agency as will plant in every locality where a favourable opening exists, an

individual capable of holding his own against the established ministry of the district. This is, to a larger degree than is commonly taken into account, the want attaching to Unitarian missions in England; but in Scotland that want is of the nature of an absolute necessity. We reason wrongly when we suppose that our occasional efforts can effect similar objects to those which the occasional efforts of Methodists or Congregationalists effect. They have only to give impulse to the generally acknowledged faith, but we have to recommend and enforce a new faith opposed to the prevalent orthodoxy; and that can only be done by means which answer to the idea of education as contrasted with that of excitement. If Mr. Harris had been able to plant here and there throughout the wide circle over which he travelled a competent person, well educated and able to take a respectable position in society, who could maintain and press forward the cause he originated, there is every reason to suppose that the new reformation for which he worked and prayed—hoping against hope—might ere this have dawned upon Scotland. The settled ministries which he did establish drooped and withered mainly through the inability of the congregations to support them according to their obvious requirements. Why could not the means so to do have been put into his hands? There was no lack of ability to supply them if the disposition had prevailed. But such a general effort for such a purpose was never thought of; and thus golden opportunities of usefulness on the widest scale which God seemed to have provided for us as a religious body, were suffered to pass by comparatively unimproved. Let us take heed that, under similar circumstances, this shall not again be the case. What is the worth of any amount of money in comparison with the glory of our successfully maintaining our legitimate position as the leaders of the present tendency of liberal thought on to the only Christian settlement that is possible for it?

The state of circumstances over which we have just glanced makes it necessary that we should look for proofs of the power of Mr. Harris's missionary exertions in the silent influence they have had upon the religious mind of the Scotch population. Nor shall we be disappointed in our search. This influence is palpable to any one who has the means of observing it, and becomes more fully apparent as observation with regard to it extends. What I have said about the effect of his Glasgow ministry, I must in substance repeat about his Scotch ministry in general. The wider field presents the same facts as the smaller one does, with such modifications as its peculiar circumstances occasioned. Throughout the country men are met with who are well known to be personally released from the bondage of the churches to which they belong, and willing to forward measures of theological comprehension, and who owe their free thought entirely in the first instance to their having listened to Mr. Harris's

ministrations. Frequently they are men of some social position —lawyers or even clergymen—who are able with some marked success to diffuse their advanced ideas through the circles in which they move. The young clergy particularly were accustomed to avail themselves of opportunities of hearing Mr. Harris preach, on account of the benefit they expected to derive from his fine elocution. I have been able, in a remote district, to establish a bond of sympathy with a total stranger of this class, solely on the ground of the knowledge acquired by these occasional attendances. Something more than elocution was learned from such attendances. One is sometimes astonished at the just and friendly way in which persons, into casual intercourse with whom one is thrown, will speak of Unitarianism when they find that the privacy of the communication is likely to be safely preserved; and it will commonly appear on inquiry that Mr. Harris's proceedings had something to do with the fair judgment entertained.

Indeed, the manner in which the literature of liberal theology has been excluded from Scotland renders such oral efforts as are associated with his name especially important in conveying a knowledge of that theology. When a young man is obliged to lock up Channing's works in his private desk as he might an unlawful publication, and when a Mechanics' Institution will submit to have all the theological portions of those works cut out in order that the book might be made fit for the library, the Unitarian missionary must be regarded as emphatically a light shining in a dark place. These two allusions are to provable facts; a part of the proof of the second being that a worthy man has in his possession what he considers a curious and valuable volume composed of the exscinded matter, which he was allowed to appropriate as refuse suited only to a depraved taste. The volume ought to be secured for an Unitarian Museum.

Public religious opinion is not now in Scotland what it was at the time of Mr. Harris's inroad upon it. It is both freer and more tolerant. Such proceedings as those by which the Rev. Thomas Wright, the author of *The true Plan of a Living Temple*, was deposed from the ministry of the Church of Scotland on a charge of heresy—unjust and shameful proceedings which still need to be exposed in their full enormity—are now impossible within the pale of that Church. Much more decided and notorious heretics than Mr. Wright was, are numbered among its ministers, and act prominently in the conduct of its affairs without any fear of public accusation. I do not attribute this change in its wide extent to Mr. Harris's operations, or to anything of a similar kind; but where other causes mainly produced it, those operations were in some considerable degree helpful toward the result. In some localities, indeed, these operations may have been the principal element in the change.

A well-informed and intelligent observer gives it to me as his opinion, "that it was the courageous spirit displayed by Mr. Harris and those who acted with him that chiefly aided in bringing about that tolerant and liberal feeling which now prevails in the West of Scotland." The view entertained of his character there at this day is essentially different from what it was. The same gentleman says, "Here, and indeed wherever he preached, he has won the esteem of good and reflecting people of all sects. Times innumerable have I heard him spoken of with admiration and respect all over the West. They regard him as an erring Christian, but as a good man, and one faithful to conscience."

So much for his successes. As to his failures, whatever they were, he might have unhesitatingly adopted the pious appeal of the prophet of old—"I have laboured in vain, and spent my strength for nought and in vain; but surely my work is with the Lord, and my judgment with my God." He himself has eloquently spoken in the same strain—"No matter whether we live or not to partake that blessedness; no matter that that sun of glory may shine upon our graves; enough for us if our children's children shall rejoice in its sacred effulgence; enough for us if, in consequence of the seed we are sowing, the golden harvest of truth and righteousness wave for our descendants; enough for us if, as the effect of our strenuous and united efforts, they, whilst enjoying its fruits of purity and loveliness, shall revert with reverential affection to our characters, shall laud our actions and hold our memories in hallowed remembrance."*

I know not whether I am altogether justified in connecting with this notice of Mr. Harris's missionary labours a reference to his frequent journeys to England during the time of his Scotch ministry. Some of those journeys partook of that character; but, whatever their object was, their distinct mention, as occupying a prominent place in this part of his history, could not be omitted. He was continually called upon to assist in the occasional services which were from time to time held among the Unitarian congregations of the south, and his presence was always welcomed as that of one who would be sure to increase in a special way the interest of every meeting he attended. He was accustomed to connect his public engagements together, so that his journeys involved, day after day, a continued occupation in preaching or speaking from the time he left home till his return. In May, 1833, he preached the annual sermon before the British and Foreign Unitarian Association in South-Place chapel, Finsbury, London, with great effect. It was afterwards published, and that in more than one form, under the title of *The Harmony of Nature, Providence and Christianity.*

* Christian Pioneer, Vol. III. p. 312.

ADDRESS AT THE OPENING OF THE SESSION OF MANCHESTER NEW COLLEGE, OCTOBER 15, 1860.

BY REV. JAMES MARTINEAU.

In entering upon a new term of academic work, our thought and feeling spontaneously look forward, and a fresh spring of hope urges us into a welcome future. A natural light of joy rests upon every open opportunity: clear as yet from the shadow of disappointment or unfaithfulness, it awakens in the young the thirst for an untried experience; in the good, the zeal for unspoiled duty; and even in the ripest age, the irrepressible faith that the errors of the past may be repaired, and every worthy conception pressed nearer to its accomplishment. Yet, while sharing to the full the thankful and elastic spirit of such a time, I cannot pass the threshold of this Anniversary without remembering the various experiences from which we meet upon it here, and which, unless vicissitude is to go without its wisdom, may well give a deeper and more earnest tone to our joint pursuits. To not a few of us the colouring of life has been changed and mellowed otherwise than by the lapse of months; and the studies awaiting us are guarded by gentle images of sorrow or sobered hopes of joy. And while our ranks, which, ere we parted, sickness had so thinned, are now happily filled in and even recruited with unusual force, we have but to look back over the year to see how large a promise for the future is needed, to compensate the public losses of the past. Since our last opening day, many a faithful labourer, whose name was as a household word among us, has laid his burthen and his honours down: the broad popular eloquence of George Harris has handed over its marvels to tradition; the pure simplicity, the assiduous fidelity, the apostolic piety of Benjamin Carpenter are lost to us, except in the healthy fruits with which they covered his field of toil; and, in more direct bereavement of our *Alma Mater*, the voice has been silenced of one of her eldest and dearest sons;—a voice so sweet and tender, so charged with gracious wisdom, so full-toned in its humanity, so trustful in its devotion, that to those who had felt its power, the name of Joseph Hutton must for ever represent the very soul of Pity, Charity and Faith. And if, in reckoning up the buried treasures of the year, we suffer the natural affinities of love and admiration to carry us beyond the rigid lines of country or of system, how can we forget that sad Florentine grave which has quenched the light of so much nobleness? or help feeling that, in the loss of Theodore Parker, the nerve of natural piety, the arm of righteous reform, the courage of every generous hope, are enfeebled not for his world alone but for ours too? In days like ours, when religious faith has lost its hold alike of the base and of the intellectual summit of society, when the life of the hour has grown foreign

to the creeds of ancient centuries, and free access to men's hearts is choked by a barricade of ecclesiastical traditions,—days of temporizing in the Church and of egotism in sects,—when theology wins its mental emancipation by moral casuistry, and Christian zeal borrows its inspiration from party policy, we can ill spare any one of those guileless and unselfish agencies. But let us not repine at the successive transmission of God's trust: let us rather take up the dropped torch of their fidelity, that it may pass from hand to hand, and, fed with a purer oil within each spirit, may shed a brighter light and a more generous warmth from age to age.

The Institution whose work we resume to-day provides for the full Academic training of a permanent succession of Nonconformist Ministers. Its very design, therefore, assumes the perpetual need in Christian society of religious guides and instructors; the natural relation of their work to the whole circle of human knowledge; and the possibility of a Scientific Theology where there is no bespoken conformity. To these principles, and to the high estimate which they imply of the Christian preacher's office, we firmly adhere, in the face of social discouragement and of philosophical disparagement. The accomplished Historian of English Civilization propounds, indeed, a law which, if it were established, would put the mark of impotency and degradation on all such aims and labours as engage us here. The improvement of mankind, he tells us, is due entirely, under similar physical conditions, to *Intellectual* discovery, and is absolutely unaffected by *Moral and Religious* causes: while the arts and sciences are "*cumulative*" and put themselves out to interest from age to age, greatness of character and purity of faith are but the talent in the napkin, incapable of increase. The virtues and the crimes cancel each other. The hero and the saint are balanced by the traitor and the libertine, and leave no residuary product for the world's heritage: the good and evil, after temporary struggle, are alike absorbed, and the permanent half-tide of human nature stands ever at the same level. In spite of the seeming freedom and sublime anticipations of conscience, the actions of mankind are necessitated in their origin and impotent in their results. Nay, it does not satisfy this theory to say that moral and religious truth, from their stationary character, are indifferent to the progress of our race; they exist, it would seem, chiefly in order to be denied; and though inoperative in themselves, they become negatively beneficent when they stimulate the intellect to contradiction, and introduce one of those ages of scepticism which are the highest landmarks of civilization. These paradoxes could not have been more damping to the enthusiasm of the Christian student and disciple, had they been expressly designed for his humiliation. Are they true? Then, in dedicating himself to moral and religious labour, he is

addressing the human weakness instead of evolving the divine strength of our nature, and missing the real hope and glory of the world in ineffectual dreams of a "kingdom of heaven." Are they true? Then, in trusting the inner voices of his humanity as the primary tones of an ethical and spiritual philosophy, to be first revealed from their interpretation and then verified by appeal to a wider consciousness, he is but chasing his own echoes and fancying them the music of the spheres. Are they true? Then, in studying the Religions of the Past, he is studying not the living power, but only the dead sign, of its stage of growth: the sacred literature which records the communings between the human and the Divine mind, and marks the ascending course of faith and aspiration; the poetry which embodies the ideal admirations of mankind; the laws and manners which betray their sense of moral right; the memorials of doctrinal struggle and speculative belief,—the Dialogues of Plato, the Confessions of Augustine, the Thoughts of Pascal; all that most draws the Christian scholar and best assuages his reverential thirst,—must be held of no account and eliminated from the dynamics of history. The only grand result of a true survey of the Past is, that it yields huge averages which swallow up the hopes of individual effort, and drown the whispered appeals to men's hearts, taken one by one.

This doctrine is the newest form of that old Nightmare of Necessity which always returns to sit upon the breast of every age whose spiritual powers are asleep. As often happens with such spectres of the mind, it has an outline shape of truth; but it is empty, and the weight that seems so oppressive is a delusion, which a spring of effort or a start of feeling will suffice to dissipate. There is certainly a sense in which the distinction may be justly drawn between the intellectual part of our nature as progressive, and the rest as constant. There is no assignable limit to the new apprehensions of truth which we may gain; while from new forms of feeling and of will,—new, that is, to our humanity,—we are no doubt precluded. It is always possible to discover an unsuspected law, to bring to light a latent class of facts or relations; but not to invent a novel passion or open a hidden field of obligation. The human reason accordingly, however uniform in its constitution through all time, has a history of its own by which it traces its course from age to age, and so multiplies its aspects as almost to disguise its self-identity: the natural science of one century may be obsolete in another; and Thales, Paracelsus and Faraday, could we bring them together, would be mutually unintelligible. The springs of action and affection, on the other hand, are immortal and unchangeable: the love and hate, the terror, the pity, the sorrow, the crime, that are woven into the epic and drama of a remote antiquity have their fibres still thrilling in the heart of to-day; the same

deeds kindle us to scorn or admiration; the same incidents startle our laughter or our tears; and Homer and Sophocles, Shakspere and Schiller, could they speak together, would find their separate tones flow into a common harmony. It is precisely this persistency in the fundamental bases of our nature that gives to literature its unwithering charm, and that binds in one great kindred the distant ages which the inequalities of science would estrange. So far, then, we can go with Mr. Buckle; we unreservedly allow that, while the movement of our humanity is chiefly traceable in shifting lines of knowledge, its essential uniformity is most strikingly evinced by the inextinguishable force of the same passions, conscience and reverence.

But are we on this account to say, that the intellect which is thus impelled to advance is also the impelling power? that, if it were there alone, its step would be as swift and strong? that the other elements of our nature might abate or increase, sleep or wake, combine or clash as they will, without affecting its competency as the agent of civilization? Far from it. The cognitive capacities of man stir only at the bidding of his affective and voluntary faculties: did his wants never quicken his perception, did his resentments never plunge him into strife, did his pity never press against his resources, did his wonder never set up its fermentation in his thought, his rational existence would remain a mere dormant possibility. The whole dynamics of his life lie in his spontaneous impulses, his regulative morals, his religious sentiments; these it is that work his understanding, dictating its ambition, determining its direction, sustaining its perseverance: and the historian who disregards their condition in order to take account of the arts and sciences alone, is like the meteorologist who should observe only the clouds, and discharge from his reckoning the winds that blow them. Call them, if you please, unprogressive in themselves, they are at least the conditions of all progress,—the constants of our human world that are the base of all its variables,—the conservative elements which give the continuity to times and nations, and out of relation to which the contrasted phenomena of change and revolution cannot be understood. As the political life of a people results from the ever-swaying balance of a principle of order on the one hand and of movement on the other, and can never be interpreted under severance of the two, so the civilization of the world is produced by imperishable affections operating under mutable conditions, and, when described without reference to both, becomes the subject of a mere party history.

The stationary aspect attributed to the moral elements of life is not insisted on in so strict a sense as to exclude the ebb and flow of character. Fluctuations are acknowledged, but are said to cancel one another and be without aggregate effect; and the course of intellectual improvement is supposed to go on inde-

pendently and undisturbed through the neap tide and the flood of good and evil. Surely such assumption overlooks the prime conditions of all mental action. Does it, then, make no difference to the Thought from what source the Thinker's inspiration comes, —whether from the passions of the bad heart, or the love and wonder of the good? or whether he is torn in self-conflict, or brings to his meditations the unbroken force of an harmonious nature? Are there no states of the Will which drain off the whole intellectual force, or turn it into a morbid instrument of delusion? Had moral causes nothing to do with the rise, and nothing with the decay, of the Hellenic and the Roman civilization? Why, then, did the Athens of Pericles sink, with all its accumulated accomplishment, philosophy and art, to the Athens of Herodes Atticus? and the city of the Scipios descend to deify a Domitian and a Caracalla? It was at the awakening call of national danger that these great peoples consolidated their social union, and becoming ennobled by the discipline of sacrifice and rich in the traditions of virtue, earned for themselves the materials, the energy, the security, for intellectual advance. And it was when the springs of the common faith and life were first weakened by dissensions and then broken by overwhelming military power, when private selfishness and licence, under the shadow of public servitude, had assumed the monstrous forms attested by Polybius and denounced by Juvenal, that not only the mental power of the Present became enervated, but the very genius and science of the Past seemed to vivify and bless no more. Were the hoarded capital of thought and knowledge the true measure and force of human progress, the Alexandria of the Ptolemies should rank higher than the young Greece whose affluence she gathered and appropriated: yet with what barren result were the rock-streams of Helikon and Parnes diverted to the sands and swamps of a mere absorbent nature! The whole history of Roman decline is but a protracted proof of the irreversible dependence of social civilization on moral vitality. Paganism, on the one hand, heir of all the culture of the past, entrenched in every stronghold of the earth, commanding boundless material power and the more formidable armoury of opinion and of scorn, dignified by countless traditions of heroism and devotion, and secured alike in the interests of the great, the tastes of the learned, and the passions of the people, was nevertheless unable to hold its own; the concentrated intellect and resource of the world wasted away from it through a mysterious inner dearth; and with its lips of proud and delicate speech, with its eye still brilliant and its brow still clear, it pined with phthisis at the heart, till the ivory sceptre dropped from its hand. And, conversely, Christianity, without a favouring alliance in the present or the past, rude in utterance, provincial in garb, inexpert in thought, passes from city to city, noiselessly lifting the latch of

private life, and after a word or two entertained as an angel that had entered unawares; and soon, through no other power than that of a new trust and the simple surprise of a divine love, it takes up whatever Heathendom was laying down, stops with a breath of purity the decay and desolation of the world, and begins from inward centres that social organism which was to substitute for universal empire an indivisible humanity. The civilization which Intellect could not avail to keep, it was reserved for Faith to win.

There is a marked difference, however, which I am quite willing to admit, between intellectual and moral force in their mode of transmission and their liability to waste and die. Knowledge, by its very nature, grows in *extent;* character in *depth:* and hence the former is certainly "*cumulative*" according to a method not predicable of the latter. Truth, once discovered, may be put on record, together with the evidence revealing it; or may be embodied in some instrument and method of art, whose rationale it supplies; and, in either case, it is thenceforth disengaged from all dependence on its discoverer and becomes the impersonal heritage of mankind. Bradley's paper on the aberration of light, Fourier's researches with regard to heat, placed certain natural laws within human cognizance, though no duplicates of their authors' genius and skill ever should appear. The air-pump incorporates the fact of atmospheric weight, the prism the law of refraction, the stereoscope the conditions of solid vision, though the existence of Otto Guericke and Snell and Wheatstone were unparalleled or forgotten. The positions thus secured by the investigations of one age serve as the point of departure for the industry of the next; Kepler's laws for the celestial physics of Newton, the discoveries of Lavoisier and Davy for the researches of Liebig, the observations of Galileo and Huygens for the instrument of Foucault. By such perpetual conversion of the *quæsita* of a prior period into the *data* of a posterior, death seems to become indifferent to science; and amid the fall of generations the intellect of mankind remains apparently immortal. To this, it must be admitted, there is nothing analogous in the moral and religious history of the world. The Philosopher may bequeath his discoveries; but not the Hero his virtue, or the Saint his sanctity. Character, religious insight, holy faith,—all the spiritual attributes which speak to the conscience and awaken the devout trusts of our nature,—are direct personal emanations and cannot be detached from the individual life of pure and lofty minds. The thoughts they think, indeed, may shape themselves into language, and go down to distant ages as the ethical wisdom or the prophet's vision or the lyric hymn of those who were most near to God; and from such words, written with the inmost spirit's flame, the fire never wholly dies. But no literature is able, like mathematical and physical exposition, to supersede and

replace the living personality of the writer, and so to stand in his stead within the universal human intelligence, that, if only his propositions remain, it would matter not though he had never been. Science is the cold and neutral speech of Nature to the watching mind through the accidental organ of a man; literature, —especially in its voices of affection, conscience and faith,—is the great confessional of humanity, the appeal of the lonely to the universal heart, the cry of deep to deep when the waves ride high and hands are stretched towards the Eternal Rock; it is essentially *personal*, our inner conference with one another, addressing itself to the sympathies, and needing the perpetual verification, of a common nature. Words and signs, which are adequate as the record of material laws and quantitative relations, are but an imperfect vehicle of this subtler action of the free spirit; and when divested of the aid of living light from the eye and tones from the voice and all the mysterious effluence of a kindling and holy presence, give but a cold and faint reflection of the struggling thought within. And, were the expression ever so perfect, it speaks only to a congenial apprehension; to the interpreter without sympathy it has no meaning, but strikes dead upon the ear, like the maxims of experience to the child, or the music of sorrow to the heart stone-deaf. Moral and spiritual truth cannot dispense with reproduction in every mind; it has no efficacy except so far as it takes us up, one by one, and finds for itself a fresh ground and response in each recipient; re-discovered as a real divine presence in the consciousness of individuals, it spreads by numerical multiplication rather than by quantitative enlargement; and as its chief differences are in depth and intensity, it defies the custody of language, and cannot, by mere record, grow from age to age. What, then, is the just inference from this distinction between natural and spiritual truth,—the one being cumulative in magnitude, the other personal in its repetition? Is it that the former alone holds the key of civilization and claims our whole attention; while the latter, in its sameness, may be thrown out of the account? Not at all; for the moral repetition may be, and assuredly is, a not less indispensable condition than the intellectual cumulation: but simply this; that while science has in itself a certain principle of self-preservation, and, once embodied in a treatise or an instrument, may bear desertion for a while and tide over a period of darkness, moral and religious influence cleaves to living persons, spreads by the mutual understanding of affection and reverence, and dies from the heart of a selfish and corrupt age. That which books and arts can do for knowledge must, in higher things, be committed to the ministry of faithful and devoted men; who, daring to yield themselves up as organs of divine truth and love, may awaken in other minds the echoes of righteousness and holy trust, and carry the contagion of faith, hope and charity, within

the reach of each several soul. Suppose all such agencies suspended; let there be none to interpret the handwriting of the Moral Law and the whispers of the Spirit; let the opaque curtains of the actual be drawn close around us for a generation and shut out every unrealized vision and darken the chamber of every seer; and it will soon be evident that, whether moral and religious truth can increase or not, it assuredly can dwindle; as the folds of appetite and interest grow thicker inwards, its sound is stifled; it shrinks to a mere potential point; and has to be recovered *ab initio*, when, through some shock of rescue, its dumb and torpid age is gone. "That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the spirit is spirit:" low and selfish desires breed their own like in every character around, till society swarms with their deformity, and everything of fairer feature is forgotten and disbelieved; and the living fires of goodness, in like manner,—the heavenly temper, the hidden sacrifice, the repose of simplicity, the energy of utter trust,—spread by proximity from soul to soul, and grow numerous in answering recognition, till multitudes are fused into unity of light and love. If, then, intellect requires for its advance only antecedent knowledge, though it be for ages dead; if conscience and faith, even to hold their own, need the presence and the voice of living goodness and devotion; it is clear that, while the former has resources for ensuring itself, the latter must have its personal propaganda,—its prophets of the open word, its preachers by the silent life,—in every generation.

The distinction already drawn, that our intellectual range has its advance *in extent*, our spiritual apprehension *in depth*, enables us to estimate the frequent taunt, that, at least within the circle of the Christian revelation, morals, metaphysics and theology have disclosed and can disclose no new truths. Suppose it were so; the fact would still not help us forward in our question, whether the disclosure of new truths is the sole force of civilization, or whether the deeper sense of old truths has not its essential influence as well. So far as these provinces become fruitful of discovery, they would themselves lie within the intellectual domain, and could only swell the triumph of its proud power. The real state of the case perhaps is this: human wonder directs itself into two fields, related in reality, divided in our apprehension; viz. (1) the play and flow of phenomena, by which, in this universe, the scenes are ever shifting before the observing eye, and through which the detecting intellect reads and registers a stated order of change; and (2) the eternal ground, the uncreated conditions, the self-existing Cause, whence, as unchanging, the successions of change all come. In the former field, we note what *evanescently happens;* in the latter, what *ever is*. Both of them make themselves a home within us through appropriate faculties of our nature; the one opening communication with

our perceptive and generalizing powers; the other with the pure Reason and Conscience. As the objects of the first are the endless transients, of the second the simple eternities, of the world, it is evident that, in proportion as they both see truly, the cognition of the one must move on and reckon anew; while that of the other must stand and only more deeply gaze; and did this test fail or shift, of *discovery* in Science, of *constancy* in Morals and Religion, the essence of the two would be confounded, and the pretensions of both upset. Is this distinction, then, consonant as it is with the nature of the objects known, any disparagement of the steady term? Can it be less important to the integrity and force of faculty whence all civilizing impulse must come, that we should present the open and sensitive eye to the patient infinitudes, than that we should keep accurate account of the laws of passing change? If our foresight of the facts of life depends on the right reading of its laws of natural succession, our insight into its spirit depends on the interpretation of its abiding and divine realities; and though we cannot say that, by truly construing the unchangeable Moral Law reflected in our nature and that eternal Mind where it is self-luminous, we ever gain new material arts or wider phenomenal vision, who can doubt that our whole tone of sentiment and affection may be thus transformed, and our entire personality be harmonized with the conditions amid which we live? Strange indeed would it be, if in a world wherein God dwells, revealing Himself in the constitution of its agents and on the field of its history, it could be neutral to its civilization whether this master-key to its whole meaning were reverently applied or absolutely missed!

In truth, the animating spring of all improvement, in individuals and in societies, is not their knowledge of the actual, but their conception of the possible. To the personal conscience there is ever present a higher than it has reached, a light beyond that throws a perpetual shadow on the track behind. And if the social reformer who takes his vow against some public sin, successfully defies the cold cautions of experience, it is because the vision of a purified future steadies his eye and nerves his arm. And when a nation, after being parcelled out and crushed for generations beneath cruel and stupid tyrannies, rises in an hour, shakes off not its fetters only, but its jealousies, vindictiveness and lassitude, and proclaims its genius to be one, generous and free,—this is no mere revulsion from a degraded past: it is that some noble leader's dream of hope has fixed before the people's mind an image glorious in its simplicity, which is their guiding star through the wilds and dangers they must pass. But for this irrepressible idea, sleeping or waking at the heart of our humanity, we should have no standard by which to try the present and measure its deformities and sins; and, until it emerges from an idea into a *faith*, till it stands with us not for a prismatic sem-

blance, but for the only real,—not for a dream of our own, but for a thought of God,—it can only breathe a sadness into life, and touch it with the flush of a hectic beauty: it may shape itself into creations of Art; it may speak in tones of Poetry; but it will lay no powerful hold upon the springs of the Will, inspire no sacrifice, dare no conflict. This is the very function of Morals and Religion,—this conversion of ideal thoughts into spiritual realities and solemn duties; and wherever there speaks to us a true interpreter, able to withdraw the veil of our inmost conscience, it is always to discover a divine substance under the form of some human dream, to detect an everlasting authority in some flitting surmise, to snatch us from the idle pathos of our poetic soliloquies, and set us abashed before them as tones from the living Word of God. So completely is our nature constituted to answer such appeal, that, till it reaches us, a sense of falsehood cleaves to everything, and we have no content; and few are burdened with spirits more uncertain, tempers more corrosive, convictions more precarious, than those who attempt to live only within the walls and by the rules of visible experience. Try to teach mankind by the mere maxims and expositions of external prudence and rectitude; offer them the whole code of wisdom deduced from the "natural laws;" abate every ideal claim, and ask them for nothing beyond their immediate powers; shew them that you have brought everything down to their own terms, and made it rational, easy and rewarding; and do you think you have found your way to either their better reason or their hearts? On the contrary, they will turn from you flattened and dispirited, thinking meanly of a life whose possibilities are so soon exhausted and of a nature from which you dare demand no more; they cannot bear this weary level; they feel the stirring of some restless wing that would shew them a deeper depth, a higher height; they know themselves made to sin upon a greater scale, and to be snatched into a sublimer redemption, than your unimpeachable rules and warnings contemplate. Humanity, left to itself, grows sick of its own company, and gasps for the relief of a holier air; and duty, however clearly seen and owned, remains languid and half done, except by the spirit that can rise beyond it. Not till the conscience has caught the vision of a divine perfection do the small human graces shine with any light. To this ideal constitution of our nature the Christian revelation, need I say, perfectly corresponds. What does its chief message set before us but a "kingdom of heaven," where the inner meaning of this world shall at length be realized, and man shall no longer disappoint the thought of God in creating him? And is not this hope presented to us by One in whose own person it was realized,—the spiritual head of our humanity, whose immortal life shines down upon us till it has drawn all men to its likeness? The whole appeal of Chris-

tianity is to secret and ideal relations that transcend the sphere of inductive experience; to the unbreathed thoughts that lurk behind the act, the tender purities that shrink from speech aloud; to the faith which "endures as seeing him who is invisible;" to the charity which keeps "from the left hand what the right hand doeth;" to the hope "that is not seen;" to the "mystery that doth not yet appear;" to the spirit "which searcheth deep things," and whose "witness" "cannot be uttered;" to the "life which is hid with Christ in God." The power, the sanctity, the solace of the gospel, all flow from this image of divine things behind the earthly and the human;—an image which no statistics of physical law can supersede or blot out, but whose colours,—unless what is highest in our nature and the past deceives us,—will continue to gleam through the dust of this world's course, and light up the darkness of its end.

Though, however, moral and religious teaching can never be a copy of the actual world, but always of a divine ideal that transcends it, yet, in order to apply it to the relations and consciousness of men, it must keep clear of all variance with their widening knowledge and highest feeling: it must be pliant to the expanding pressure of new and nobler thought; and take care never to be the material contradiction, but always the holy transfiguration, of the universe, of history, of life, as the freshest and largest intelligence represents them. This necessity it is that renders it impossible to dispense with the fullest mental culture in those who aspire to a share in the Christian guidance of their time, and demands of them that they keep well abreast of the science, the scholarship, the philosophy, of their age. The "kingdom of heaven" is not the same in its picture, though continuous in its spirit, through the centuries as they succeed: once it was the little Hebrew realm; to the Baptist it was Messiah's coming; to the Apostles the return of Christ and the end of the historic æons; to the Chiliasts the Millennium; to the medieval Catholicism the Roman theocracy; to the Evangelical Protestants the invisible Church of the elect; to a few the life to come; to *all*, according to the measure of their conception, the Divine thought and life in the world. It has transmigrated from form to form as each became too small to hold it, or was dissolved by the touch of time; and now, amid the riches of our modern experience, beneath the canopy of Herschel's sky, upon the surface of a Lyell's earth, at the end of Bunsen's ages of humanity, and in presence of a Müller's conspectus of tongues and peoples, it can never resume its antiquated shapes; nor dare we finally fix it with a Lo! here, or Lo! there; but can only wait upon the seasons of an expanding Providence, knowing that through all the "kingdom of God is within us." From the mere fact that Theology is not so much one of the special segments of knowledge, as the comprehension of them all under the light and

within the embrace of spiritual faith, it comes into contact with all the lines of human research: it belies its very nature when it rests content with the *cram* of professional learning, or only fills the torrent of a narrow zeal; and in its discipline it needs no less a genuine intellectual catholicity than, in its application, an unhesitating breadth and warmth of love. Whilst the simple devotedness of a pure and pious mind is a power unspeakably higher than any mere mental gift, it cannot in our time put itself forth with its proper efficacy, except under condition of competent sympathy with the modes and images of thought that distinguish the present from the past. In different strata of society the exigencies of ministration are doubtless in some degree different; though I believe there are none where the apprehensive tact and ready resource and refined bearing of the scholar and the gentleman will not be felt as powerful aids to the charity and devotion of the Christian. But whatever scope there may be, in the great Infirmary of human ills, for faithful labour in every form, *some* at least there ought ever to be who, while not slow to bind the wounded and tend the cup of cold water, can look beyond the suffering symptoms of the hour, or even the epidemic of the day, and following the maladies of our humanity to their deepest ground can obey the Supreme Physician's voice, "Bring them hither to me."

But from the theoretical defence of our objects in this Institution I must turn to notice in conclusion the present aspect of its practical operation. Of the four Students who completed their term at the close of the last Session, all are at work in congenial spheres of ministerial duty except one who, having the advantage of a Hibbert scholarship, prolongs his studies for a further period. Six new Students for the ministry, all of whom have satisfactorily passed their entrance examination, take their place in the first year; one of whom, admitted by special arrangement, comes to us from the Transylvanian brethren; the first link in a chain, not we trust soon to be broken, of sympathy and intercourse with a foreign church, which has a history longer than our own, and which, distant as it is, has been brought near to us at the costly sacrifice of an honoured and faithful life. This eighth Session since our removal from the North thus opens with eighteen Divinity Students,—a number which, so far as we remember, has never been exceeded in the present generation. A new, and to all its teachers a most welcome, feature has been given to the present Session, by the regular entrance into the College of two Students who are intended for civil life, but whose qualifications for the duties of accomplished citizens are not, it is wisely thought, likely to be unfavourably affected by some tincture of sacred learning and thoughtful apprehension of religious principle. In the report of the classes of University College, the names of some of our Students occur with honour-

able mention: in the Senior Greek, Mr. Dowson obtained the first prize. In the Junior Latin, Mr. Odgers received the first prize and certificate, and in Junior Greek the fourth certificate. And Mr. Pilcher obtained the prize in the Lower Junior Mathematics; the fourth certificate in the Junior Latin; and the sixth certificate in the Junior Greek. May younger Students emulate these honourable examples, not indeed in the mere ambition for distinction, but from the conscientious resolve to do soundly whatever is done at all, and from that love of clear and accurate learning which is one of the marks of a faithful and earnest mind!

It is perhaps stepping beyond my province to notice events that belong to the internal history of other Institutions than our own. Yet so nearly associated are the functions of our College with those both of this Hall, where our Theological Students receive their instruction, and of University College, where our Juniors have their chief classes, that no new incident which draws any of them closer can be indifferent to us; and I should be suppressing a feeling as natural as it is sincere, did I not express the respectful congratulations of my colleagues and myself on the appointment to the Chair of History in University College of the accomplished Principal of University Hall. May this enlargement in the sphere of action which opens around these walls make them more and more the centre and the home of noble aspirations, of enlightened principle, and of generous and manly ties!

PAULINE HISTORY OF CEPHAS.

Sir,

Encouraged by your insertion in the Christian Reformer for July (p. 479) of my attempt to vindicate the apostle Peter, and to clear him from any difference whatever with the apostle Paul, I shall proceed with my "Pauline History of Cephas," in order to establish, on the authority of certain old MSS. (referred to in my former paper), that this Cephas (not Peter) was the person whom Paul rebuked at Antioch in Syria for anti-christian views of Messiah's revelation. But it may be expected that I shall, in the first place, attempt to shew who this Cephas was. That he boasted of being by descent "a Hebrew, an Israelite, of the seed of Abraham, and a minister of Messiah," I think may be inferred from 2 Cor. xi. 21, 22. That he had been a disciple and follower of Jesus during his lifetime, and a witness of his resurrection, may be taken for granted from 1 Cor. xv. 4, 5 (comp. Luke xxiv. 18). That Cephas was an early member of the Jewish Christian church raised up at Jerusalem by the preaching of the apostles after the day of Pentecost, but chiefly by Peter and John (see Acts i., ii., iii.), we may, I think, be assured from the way in which Paul speaks of Cephas in certain passages of Galatians, quoted in my last paper. At this early date, these Jewish Christians were by the unbelieving Jews considered only as a sect of the Jews, and were denominated by their fellow-countrymen "Nazarenes" (Acts xxiv. 5, 14); consisting, however, of two classes of Jews (Acts vi. 1, and John xii. 20),—first, the Hebrews, of the pure Jewish stock, and to this class apparently both Paul (2 Cor. xi. 22) and

Cephas belonged; and second, the Hellenists, or Grecians, who had become proselytes to the Jewish Law, like Nicolas (Acts vi. 5), and consequently had been circumcised previously to their conversion to Christianity. The first church of Jewish Christians which was established out of Judea was that at Antioch, A.D. 41. It was composed of those Nazarenes who fled from Jerusalem on the death of Stephen (Acts ix. 19), A.D. 36 and 37. Additions were made from the Hellenists of Syria, that is, Jewish proselytes; so that party (Jewish Christians) prevailed at Antioch, where Latin and Greek were spoken. Probably, therefore, *they* changed the name of the sect to "Christiani" (Acts xi. 26); for no other cause can be assigned* for translating the name into Latin,—the two names, Nazarene and Christian, being for a long time after considered even by the Jews as synonymous; for when Agrippa said unto Paul (Acts xxvi. 28), "Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian," Paul understood Agrippa to say that he was almost persuaded to be what Paul was; and Paul, when he was accused before Felix by Tertullus of being a "Nazarene" (Acts xxiv. 5), did not deny, but confessed, that he belonged to that sect or "schism." So also when Peter, in his First Epistle (iv. 16), says, "If any man suffer for being a Christian," he, writing to Jewish Christians, cannot be supposed to mean any other Christian. But to return. There were other converts soon added (A.D. 42, 43) to the church of Antioch, not of Hellenists (proselytes), but of Greeks (heathen converts), who had never been circumcised and refused to be circumcised. This caused a difference between the circumcised and the uncircumcised Christians. About this time, A.D. 40, Paul was at Tarsus, having been driven from Jerusalem because the "Grecians" (Acts ix. 29), or Greek proselytes, with whom he had "disputed," sought to kill him; and about the same time, while at Tarsus (Acts ix. 30), it probably was that Paul, "three years after his conversion (Gal. i. 18), went up thence to Jerusalem to see Cephas, and abode with him fifteen days," but without seeing any apostle or any person other than James, the Lord's brother. The coincidence of time and circumstances almost justify us in supposing that Cephas had already taken side with the circumcision against Paul, who from his conversion had taken up the cause of the heathen converts, or the uncir-

* Lardner and others think that the name "Christiani," being Latin, it was first used by the Roman governors and judges in the provinces of Syria and Asia Minor, to distinguish that class of Jews who were followers of their prophet Jesus, and was understood by the Romans to comprehend all heathen Christians, whether circumcised and whether Jews or not; that is, they did not inquire whether the Christians were Jewish proselytes or not. But it is not improbable that when the dispute at Antioch as to circumcision was at its height, the Nazarene party rejected the Roman name, while the party of the uncircumcised heathen converts took it up, to distinguish themselves from the circumcision, and from Cephas, their schismatic leader. But schism implies a separation from communion—and such separation, two meeting-houses; and in the speeches and apostolic letter at the council of Jerusalem, we find support given to this view of the position of the Christians at Antioch. James says (Acts xv. 19), "Wherefore my sentence is, that we trouble not those who, from among the Gentiles, are turned unto God:" "For Moses hath of old times in every city them that preach (the Law) of Moses, the same being read in the synagogues every sabbath-day," viz. both to Jews and Christian Jews. Again, the letter (Acts xv. 23) is addressed, not to Nazarenes, but specifically "unto the brethren who are of the Gentiles in Antioch and Syria and Cilicia." Again (ver. 24), "Forasmuch as we have heard that certain who came out from us have troubled you,.... but to whom we gave no such commandment, it seemed good unto us to send chosen men" (as opposed to these unaccredited persons) "with our beloved Barnabas and Paul, men who have hazarded their lives for the name of the Lord Jesus." Here we have accredited testimony to the views of Barnabas and Paul set against the unaccredited views of Cephas and his party. See Gal. ii. 11, to the end, beginning with, "But when Cephas was come to Antioch," as given in full in my last.

cumcision; but hopeless of a compromise with Cephas from this visit, Paul had returned to Tarsus, whence he was soon after brought to Antioch by Barnabas (Acts xi. 25). It is clear that, after this, Cephas became more bigoted to his own views; and thus there is reason for conjecture that his views were, even now, such as he probably entertained during the lifetime of Jesus, such as some of the apostles themselves entertained at that time, viz. that the Messiah was "to restore the kingdom to Israel,"—views of a temporal reign of Messiah which even the first appearance to Cephas (see 1 Cor. xv. 4, 5; Luke xxiv. 18) of the risen Jesus could not dispel, even though assured of his error by those (of whom he may have been one) who witnessed the ascension (Acts i. 6, 7). Such being the views of Cephas, it is evident they were dangerous to the spread of Christianity; not only because they were promotive of rebellion against Rome, but because they were prejudicial also to the true interests of Christians, fixing their prospects to this world regardless of the next, and ultimately, as we shall find to be the case with Cephas and his party, destroying the benefits of the resurrection of Jesus, by leaving no hopes in the mind of a future state different from or higher than those which the Jews already possessed. We cannot wonder, then, that Paul's more enlightened views of the reign of Messiah should from this date have placed him in direct opposition to Cephas. Cephas, on the other hand, seems from this date also to have decided to become a missionary, treading in the footsteps of Paul, with the view of frustrating Paul's efforts for the propagation of Christianity in heathen countries.

Accordingly we find from Paul's Epistle to the Galatians, written at Corinth A.D. 52 (as stated in my last paper), that during Paul's first missionary tour with Barnabas from Antioch (Acts xiii. 2—14, 26—28), involving a period of three years, A.D. 45—48, Cephas, accompanied (as will be seen afterwards) by Cerinthus, another Nazarene of the church of Jerusalem, must here be assumed to have belonged to those "certain persons (Acts xv. 1) who came down from Judea (A.D. 49) and taught the brethren," the Greek converts at Antioch, "that unless circumcised they could not be saved." We must here assume further, that on his return to Antioch with Barnabas, Paul found there "these false brethren (Gal. ii. 4), who had been unawares brought in with the design of privately spying out the liberty" of these brethren at Antioch, that is, their exemption from circumcision. The conference at Jerusalem which resulted, A.D. 49 or 50, and Paul's rebuke of Cephas, have been given in my last letter. But it is worthy of special observation that the circular letter of James and the apostles confirming Paul's views of the exemption of heathen converts from circumcision, is introduced by these words (Acts xv. 24): "Forasmuch as we have heard that certain who went out from us have troubled you with words subverting your souls, saying, Ye must be circumcised and keep the Law, to whom we gave no such commandment," &c. It is true that Paul, in his account of this conference given to the Galatians, says, "that when James (the Lord's brother), Cephas and John (Mark), who seemed to be pillars, perceived the grace that was given unto me, they gave to me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship, that we should go to the heathen and they unto the circumcision." This implies a compromise between Paul and Cephas, the true meaning of which must be thus understood:—both of them might become missionaries if they chose, both might visit heathen countries; but Paul was to preach exemption from circumcision to those converts he should make among "uncircumcised" heathen, while Cephas was to restrict his preaching to circumcised heathen only, that is, Jewish proselytes, there being no restraint put upon either so far as regards preaching the gospel to the Jews. But Cephas must have acted on this occasion with duplicity, not only towards Paul, but towards James and the church of Jerusalem; for from the whole tenor of the Epistle to the Galatians, we cannot doubt that Cephas, leaving Jerusalem (cir. A.D. 52), but without again visiting Antioch, proceeded direct to Galatia and preached the gospel there; but not Paul's gospel. For he says to the

Galatians (i. 6), "I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him—that is, myself—who called you into the grace of Messiah (cir. A.D. 50) unto another gospel; which indeed is not another message of good tidings: on the contrary, that some now with you would trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Messiah." Again (ver. 9), "If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received" from me, "let him be anathematized;" for I assure you (ver. 11) "that the gospel which was preached unto you by me is not after man." These verses, taken in connection with the rebuke which Paul tells the Galatians he gave to Cephas at Antioch, make it clear that Cephas was he whom Paul points out as "troubling" the Galatians in the same way as he had "troubled" the church of Antioch.

If we now take up Paul's two Epistles to the Thessalonians, written at Corinth cir. A.D. 52, we shall find satisfactory proof that Cephas, leaving Galatia, must have followed Paul into Macedonia, A.D. 51, "troubling" the churches there, and exciting against Paul the bitter enmity of the Jewish population. Even in Luke's history (Acts xvii. 5, cir. A.D. 51) we find traces of Cephas and his party: "The Jews who believed not, moved with envy, took unto them certain lewd fellows of the baser sort, and gathered a mob, and set all the city in an uproar," &c. Beza translates these lewd fellows into "circumferendis viris sceleratis—*Anglicè*, "wicked vagabonds" (comp. Acts xix. 13). This mixed mob, Paul insinuates, in his First Epistle (ii. 15, 16), as will be seen by and by, to have been led on by Cephas. In fact, Cephas, having now joined Cerinthus, had, like the latter, become a heretic (see Lardner's History of Heretics) as well as a schismatic.

That this Jewish mob had terrified such Jewish converts as Paul had made at Thessalonica (see Acts xvii. 3, 4) and forced them to join Cephas, seems probable from this,—that both of Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians are addressed to heathen converts solely, whose conversion "had been so spread abroad (1 Thess. i. 8) through Macedonia and Achaia" (from the capital of which, Corinth, Paul was writing), "that he had no need to speak it; for they themselves"—people in every place where he had been—tell us (tell me) "what wonders my coming among you had effected, and how ye turned to God from idols to serve the living and true God; and to look forward to the spread of the gospel of his Son from heaven, whom He raised from the dead, Jesus, who will deliver us from the impending punishment" (meaning of the Jews, as will immediately be made apparent). "For ye, brethren (ii. 1), yourselves know that my coming among you was not in vain; for my exhortation was not of erroneous doctrine, nor of impure conduct, nor was it delivered by me with guile; but as I was permitted of God to be put in trust with the gospel, I spoke to you as one so entrusted; not as one seeking to please men, but as one seeking to please God, who trieth the hearts of all. For the same reason, never at any time did I use flattering words, as ye know, nor assume the cloak of covetousness; God is my witness." In these passages we cannot fail to discover a contrast between Paul and some opponent (see Belsham, in loco, Vol. IV. p. 27, note), and its application to Cephas seems obvious. Farther proof that Paul is writing to heathen converts from idolatry may be gathered from what follows. He calls upon them (ii. 12) "to walk worthy of God, who has called them unto his glorious reign" upon earth (viz. that which they were expecting or looking forward to); thanking God that "they received the word or message of God which they heard from him (Paul) not as the word of men" (not as having temporal views, as Cephas taught), but as it is in truth, the word of God." Paul next exhorts these converts from idolatry to bear their sufferings in patience, "after the example of the churches of God in Judea which are in Christ;" adding (ii. 14), "For ye also are suffering like things of your own countrymen, even as they of the Jews, who both killed the Lord Jesus and their own teachers, and have persecuted me (ver. 15, 16); for they please not God, and are opposers of all his teachers, forbidding me to speak to the heathen" (in which Cephas joins them) "that they may be saved. Thus

they are continually filling up their sins; but their punishment is coming upon them, even to their extermination."

In concluding the Second Epistle (2 Thess. iii. 1), written at Corinth like the First, and in the same year, A.D. 52, we find these very remarkable words: "Finally, my brethren, pray for me, that the word of the Lord may have free course and be glorified" (viz. here at Corinth) "even as with you, and that I may be delivered from unreasonable and wicked men." Query: Were the "certain lewd fellows of the baser sort," formerly spoken of as being at Thessalonica ("these wicked vagabonds")—were they now at Corinth? This leads us to an examination of the two Epistles to the Corinthians, which throw great light on the farther history of Cephas. But it would extend this paper too much to enter upon this examination now.

August 8, 1860. PETER.

CORRESPONDENCE.

REV. WILLIAM HINCKS AND MANCHESTER NEW COLLEGE.

SIR,

IN my former letter I was careful to express some doubt whether my resignation of my situation at York hastened in any degree the crisis in the affairs of the College which led to its removal. I must accept Mr. Wood's testimony that it did so. I am without documents, as it is known to my friends that I lost all my papers of every kind, with much valuable property, by shipwreck. I have now no recollection whatever, although all the occurrences of that period made a deep impression on my mind, and I seem to myself to retain them clearly, of my having had any reason to believe that I hastened Mr. Wellbeloved's resignation. If anxiety respecting my own prospects erased from my mind a circumstance in which I should naturally have felt so much interest, I greatly wonder at it; but my belief is that I never was made acquainted with the fact. However this may be, I am confident that Mr. Wellbeloved's approaching retirement was known to me; that its consequence, a removal of the institution, was anticipated as certain; and that having what appeared to me sufficient grounds, perhaps in knowledge of the opinion of peculiarly influential individuals, for judging what was likely to be done in what immediately affected myself,—whereas before, though dissatisfied with pecuniary results, I had hope of improvement, which with my interest in my employment, my sense of the importance of the office I held, and my dread of change and the new anxieties it must bring, counterbalanced the dissatisfaction,—now I had no longer anything to expect from the future, and, feeling that I must soon be unsettled, I thought it wrong to delay the necessary effort to form a new plan of life.

My friend Mr. Wood seems inclined to maintain, on the authority of the documents to which he has access, that I have entirely lost sight of my own reasons for resigning my office. This is absolutely impossible. I could not with propriety assign in an official letter the reasons I have referred to; and the other cause of discontent was one which might have led me to leave, as he has sufficiently shewn, at any time for years

previously, and seemed quite sufficient in itself. There is then no real inconsistency between Mr. Wood's statement and mine, excepting that I did not believe myself to have even hastened a little the retirement of Mr. Wellbeloved, towards whom I had the strongest feelings of respect and attachment as a tutor, a colleague and a friend.—I think Mr. Wood might as well have left undisturbed at this time and in the present connection the discussions between me and the College Committee on pecuniary affairs. These things have long passed away and ceased to interest. Of course I undertook my office expecting to live by it. The emoluments of the resident tutor depended much on the number of students, especially of lay students. That number had diminished before I went. I was induced to hope that it would again increase. It never did so to any considerable extent or with any permanence. We can all now see that it was not likely to do so, and that only the solid reputation of the institution and the exertions of some of its friends enabled it to secure any beyond the foundation students. For my part, I have long entirely approved of and rejoiced in the change of views as to the higher education in the great body of the laity among the Non-subscribing Presbyterians, consequent on changes going on outside their body, which prevented the desired increase. But of this change I happened to be the victim, having to bring up a family and support an expensive establishment with insufficient means. The Committee were not illiberal: they manifested kindness and a desire if possible to make the arrangements more satisfactory. But they looked at the affair from a different point of view, and had other considerations which they were bound to take into account. Hence discussions from time to time arose, and in the end I left my situation with an absolute pecuniary loss which I could ill bear. I suppose the evil was unavoidable. I have long since ceased to complain of it, laying the blame, if there was any, to my own want of foresight respecting the changes of the times, and of steadiness in resisting, when well and happily situated, the application made to me, which certainly did me great honour, to undertake an office which I should never have sought, and was on many accounts indisposed to accept.

Toronto, Sept. 26, 1860. William Hincks.

ON NATURAL DEPRAVITY.

Sir,

Allow me a few more words on the subject of Natural Depravity. I think that I understand Mr. Hinton's arguments, but still cannot say that I am convinced. I will allow that God must create finite and fallible beings, *liable* to err; but it is not very evident that on this account they *must* err. If there were a logical necessity that a being liable to err should always be a sinful being, how then could the Unitarian idea of Christ have been arrived at? But Mr. Hinton does not altogether ascribe the sinful state of man to necessity; he says that liability to err conjoined to the principle of self-love "*naturally* degenerates into selfishness, which is the germ of sin" (or I think he could

not object to say, "which is sin"); which I suppose means that it degenerates because of a law of nature—that is, because of a law of God; which is as much as to say that God has made it so that man must degenerate into sin. This is an evident stumbling-block; and to say that it could not be otherwise, is simply to say that the laws of nature could not have been fashioned otherwise.

He says further, that evil is made subservient to the production of good, "just as medicine in the hand of a skilful physician," and "is a necessary part of the Divine government." But this seems to me to leave the difficulty just where it was; because if good can only be wrought through the agency of evil, such a state of affairs is of itself an evil; it would be much better if good could be wrought in another way. That the physician has to use medicine to effect his cures is in itself a disadvantage; it would be better if he cured without medicine, and he would gladly do so if he could. It is his want of power that obliges him to resort to unpleasant means of cure. To say that "evil is a necessary part of the Divine government," is therefore to say that God is obliged to make use of means which in themselves are objectionable to Him.

Mr. Hinton further says, that "evil is founded in wisdom and goodness as well as in necessity," and that the religious mind sees this,—which looks very much like an endeavour to reconcile the existence of evil with that of God by making an apology for sin itself. I think I have occasionally heard something of the same sort from our own pulpits, and am therefore for the sake of our faith the more anxious to raise my protest against it. Of all modes of solving the difficulty, this one appears to me to be the most false and dangerous; for I cannot but think it must tend to make us look upon sin with more of complacency, and I believe it to be contradicted by the direct word of God in our own souls. To say that the experiences of religion teach us this, seems to me to say what is directly the contrary to the truth. One of our most revered divines, in treating of the same subject, has said as follows: "For myself, I can never sit at the feet of Jesus and yield up a reverential heart to his great lessons, without casting myself upon the persuasion that God and evil are everlasting foes; that never and for no end did He create it; that His will is utterly against it, and never touches it but with annihilating force."

But, Sir, in making these objections I must confess that I have no counter theory to bring forward myself. The fact is, that try the argument which way you will, it always appears to me that you arrive at conclusions that are inadmissible. The end that we must come to is this, that the Unitarian as well as the Trinitarian must acknowledge boldly that there are mysteries incomprehensible in the ways of the Most High. But if He has seen fit to veil from us the answers to the questions, "Whence is evil?" and "Why is it?" all that really concerns our spiritual growth He has made plain enough. I think that He has told us clearly that, from whencesoever it may be, it is not of Him, but that it is His enemy, which He fights against; that He is always waiting near us, ready, if when we see the foe approach we throw ourselves on His protection, to contend against it for us and bear us off the victors; and He has told us over and over again through the experiences of life, that through Him alone can we hope to conquer.

Will it be urged, that if we look upon evil as the enemy of God, and can offer no solution to the question of why He allows it to exist, we run into danger of losing our faith in the existence of God? I answer, that there is no such danger to the truly religious mind; that, on the contrary, it is easier to put faith in Him when we look upon evil as His irreconcilable enemy, than when we treat it as in any degree His friend. The one may be the conclusion of our own arguments, but the other is the substance of the word of God.

I have no intention, Sir, of addressing you again on this subject. The suggestions that I have thrown out in rather a random manner must be taken merely as suggestions to be worked out by your readers, many of whom are doubtless much better able to treat the subject than your humble servant, FIDES.

ORIGEN'S HETERODOXY.

SIR,

I WAS much surprised at reading the following passage in the review of the Essays and Reviews in the last No. of the Christian Reformer, p. 599: "We remark that Origen, the father of the science of biblical interpretation, was a Unitarian, expressly forbidding prayer to Christ." In the account given by Lardner of Jerome is contained a summary of the charges against Origen. Lardner adds this remark: "It is not allowed by all that Origen himself was heterodox in the doctrine of the Trinity." It may, I presume, be inferred from this passage that the learned and most industrious author could not have been acquainted with anything in Origen which forbids prayer to Christ, which would be an undeniable proof of the heterodoxy of Origen on the subject of the Trinity. I beg, therefore, to request the reviewer, through your pages, to point out the portion of the writings of Origen on which his assertion is founded. L.

THE ADVANCED GUARD OF THE HUMAN RACE.

SOCIETY, indeed, has its great men and its little men, as the earth has its mountains and its valleys. But the inequalities of intellect, like the inequalities of the surface of our globe, bear so small a proportion to the mass, that in calculating its great revolutions, they may safely be neglected. The sun illuminates the hills while it is still below the horizon; and truth is discovered by the highest minds a little before it becomes manifest to the multitude. This is the extent of their superiority. They are the first to catch and reflect a light, which without their assistance must in a short time be visible to those who lie far beneath them.—*Lord Macaulay.*

CRITICAL NOTICES.

UNITARIAN SERMONS.

Jesus the Christ, the True Foundation: a Sermon on the Unitarian Basis of Church Communion. By G. Vance Smith, B.A., Ph.D., Minister of St. Saviourgate Chapel, York. 12mo. Pp. 18. London—Whitfield.

The Christian Life. Two Sermons preached in Essex-Street Chapel, Strand. By J. Panton Ham. 8vo. Pp. 24. London—Whitfield.

A voice potent for good or evil has of late dogmatically asserted that the Unitarians are a nearly extinct sect. Such publications as those the titles of which we have given above shew that if our ministers and congregations are dying out, they can nevertheless speak and act as if in full possession of "the Christian life." So long as our ministers can preach vigorous sermons like those of Mr. Smith and Mr. Ham, full of manly religious thought and scriptural argument, and conceived and expressed in the true Christian spirit, and our congregations listen to such discourses with pleasure and request their publication, and when published give them a wide circulation,—the best possible refutation will be given to those who, in simple ignorance or crafty ill-will, tell the world that Unitarians are an extinct or a moribund body.

Circumstances in the city of York, probably not unknown to our readers, have given peculiar timeliness and interest to Mr. Vance Smith's exposition of Church Communion on the Unitarian Basis. A worthy clergyman, holding preferment in York Minster, lately remarked, in an attempt (more courageous than prudent) to magnify the significance of a recent conversion, that "varied phases of faith" prevail amongst us. We admit and glory in the fact, when reduced to its rightful dimensions, and when its causes and consequences are correctly explained. It is the result of that private judgment which is the right of every church and every man. But even in their wider results our "varied phases of faith" do not interfere with our religious life or our church communion. They afford no ground for the popular misconceptions which widely prevail respecting us. Mr. Smith thus describes those prejudices:

> "We are, with many, a self-willed denomination, who do not hearken as we ought to the Word of God, but prefer to follow the dictates of our own blind understandings; we are bound together by no definite bond of sound doctrine, but have only vague, uncertain or negative principles; the liberty of thought and speech, which we so much value, is inconsistent with any firm adherence to Christian Truth; because we do not bind one another to the public confession of a formal creed, therefore, as a body of worshipers, we have no common ground of faith that is clear, definite and scriptural,—but are exposed, and accustomed, to be tossed about by every wind of strange doctrine."—Pp. 4, 5.

In correction of these misconceptions, Mr. Smith undertakes to "shew that we do stand, as a religious community, upon a broad and sure foundation; that, while not attempting to limit and control one another by any *Creed*, and while endeavouring to allow and to use the utmost liberty of thought and speech, we do yet most fully admit a principle of union which is distinctly and essentially both Scriptural and Christian." He makes good his ground by shewing that this is so not merely

because we are united as a body of religious persons, worshipers of Almighty God, but because we take CHRIST as our Teacher, recognize his authority and copy his example.

In answering the question, why Unitarians do not join some of the established communities around them, and why they think it necessary to stand apart and form their own, Mr. Smith is led directly into the very heart of the Trinitarian controversy. He shews the subordination of Christ to God, and that the existence and authority of the Son are entirely derived from the Father. He next proceeds to shew that in the doctrine of Jesus, the Christ, the Son of God, Unitarians possess a great and fundamental truth on which to build their church.

After an excellent description of the working and spirit of a Christian church based on the doctrine of Jesus, the Christ, the Son of God, Mr. Smith thus happily proceeds not only to defend the Unitarian liberty, but to carry the war into the orthodox camp, by shewing the strange inconsistencies into which they are led, spite of their professed adherence to an uniform faith:

"In all this, again, I repeat, there is nothing that ought to be stigmatized as vague, uncertain, or merely negative in its character. LIBERTY, indeed, is there for every earnest mind to read and search and judge for itself; but when once the Law is made plain to the questioning heart, then *Obedience* is the single course of duty left open to each of us.

"A church which takes its stand upon the Scriptures alone, finding in them its only Confession of Faith, and leaving the individual heart and conscience free to judge of their contents, will, doubtless, to some extent be open to the charge of holding forms of belief which vary from time to time: because one man, and one generation, will vary from another in regard to points deemed of importance. This cannot be denied. But then the *remedy* for this will not be found in the imposition of creeds, however well considered and carefully composed they may be. This will certainly not prove an effectual remedy; as we may see by the example of our National Church, within which may surely be found differences of belief as great as any that can be alleged of our own community. Who has not heard of subscribing Articles in 'non-natural' senses? Who has not heard of High Church and Low Church and Broad Church; of Calvinism and its opposite Arminianism; of Puseyites and Evangelicals, and so forth; all within the limits of one and the same communion? —whose members are supposed, too, by an extraordinary fiction, to be all harmonious members of the one body of Christ, even by virtue of a common subscription to the same doctrinal formularies—but who are yet, in secret sympathies and beliefs, no more harmonious than fire and water."—Pp. 12, 13.

We have not space to speak of the corrections and alleviations which Mr. Smith suggests may be found for the evils that result from our use of religious liberty.

Of Mr. Ham's two sermons, the first is entitled, "Jesus Christ the Law of Human Life." It is able, eloquent and fearless, happily combining spiritual, doctrinal and practical views. On the spiritual Lordship of Christ, it speaks in a way which no one will misunderstand.

"I cannot see their consistency who call Jesus *Lord*, and yet believe in other Lords. Apostles spoke thus, 'To us there is *One* God the Father, and *One Lord* Jesus Christ.' 'There is *One* Mediator or medial person between God and men—the Man Christ Jesus.' We of the Unitarian Church, who have vindicated at such heavy social penalties the Unity of the Father's *Godship*, ought to be equally jealous of the Unity of the Christ's *Lordship*. There is no religious sect more intolerant, more exclusive, on the subject of the One

Godship of the Father than Unitarians: and properly so. It is right to be very jealous of this great first truth of religion. Alas! for our testimony, when we get lax on the doctrine of the Divine Unity, when we begin to see, or imagine that we see, any truth in the doctrine of the Trinity. I plead for the same noble intolerance, the same logical exclusiveness, in behalf of the other great Christian verity, that Jesus Christ is the *One Lord*, and that every knee ought to bow to him as the One Lord, to the glory of God the Father."—P. 8.

In his second discourse, Mr. Ham treats of "Christ's Unity with the Father illustrated in his Moral and Spiritual Influence on Human Character and Life." With an unction not always found in Unitarian sermons, the preacher argues first for the natural constitutional unity between the human soul and God, and next for the vital moral and spiritual unity between God and Christ. The extract and illustrative note which we give from the second head will, we think, make our readers desirous of seeing the whole discourse.

"Contrary as the ecclesiastical doctrine of the Trinity is both to Scripture and reason, we cannot deny that its exaltation of Jesus Christ to a personality in the Godhead has had a most humanizing influence on Christendom, and has largely controlled and counteracted the very evil influence of that representation of God in the Trinitarian scheme which invests him with the attributes of stern and inflexible severity under the misnomer of justice. The practical influence of Trinitarianism has been to open a wide and impassable gulf between God and His creatures, and destroy the natural consciousness of filial relationship in the Christian Church towards the Supreme and beneficent Father of all men. The Churches do not trust and rejoice in *God* as a Father, but rather tremble before and turn from Him as an uncompromising and vindictive Judge,—a Being who can never be lenient and merciful, never pardon even the slightest offences in His creatures, but must always have a moral compensation or satisfaction.* Now this repulsive doctrine would have sunk Christianity into oblivion, had it not been for that other element in the Trinitarian scheme which invests the beautiful historical image of the Man Jesus with the dignity of absolute Deity. False as the whole scheme is, we cannot be blind to, nor fail to rejoice in, this compensatory dogma, which has kept before the world an image of God, such as its instincts bid it welcome and rejoice in. Taught to identify Jesus Christ with God, men have turned towards him with love, and trust, and hope, and have been saved from that abandonment of despair into which their conceptions of God would have plunged them. A most blessed circumstance is it for Christendom and civilization, that *not* the Trinitarian *Father*, but the Trinitarian *Son*, is the God of the Churches. The unity between God and Christ, irrational and unscriptural as it is, as set forth in the orthodox formulas of faith, has been the salvation of Trinitarian Christianity as a religion, and to this hour gives Trinitarianism *all the power that it has* as a religious system in the world."—Pp. 21, 22.

We hope that the sermons both of Mr. Smith and Mr. Ham will be immediately placed in the Catalogues of our Tract Societies and receive a wide circulation. They will be useful and instructive to Unitarian as well as orthodox readers, if the latter can be secured.

---

* "It is the trite and favourite reasoning of orthodox divines to represent sin as infinite, because committed against an infinite Being. Then it follows that *every* moral feeling and action in the creature towards the Creator is infinite,—love, reverence, obedience,—whatever the creature is capable of in its moral emotions and expressions is respectively infinite. We are thus driven to the logical absurdity of asserting that a finite being has infinite capabilities.

The Case of the Ilminster School, as to the Eligibility of Dissenting Trustees; with the Arguments of Counsel and the Judgment of the House of Lords. From the Short-hand Writer's Notes, with Explanatory Introduction. Pp. 48. London—Maxwell. 1860.

This pamphlet supplies materials for an interesting chapter in the history of religious liberty in England. The miserable resistance of the Church party at Ilminster to the introduction of Dissenters into the Trusteeship of an educational charity, has occasioned long and costly legal arguments, and at the last the cause of ecclesiastical intolerance seemed to prevail,—the appeal against the decree of the Lords' Justices having been dismissed consequent on an equality of votes in judgment, the Lord Chancellor and Lord Cranworth affirming, and Lord Chelmsford and Lord Wensleydale reversing, the liberal judgment of the Master of the Rolls. But the discussion of the subject had its rightful effect, and in a recent Act of Parliament (23 Vict. cap. 11) a practical remedy is supplied, and Trustees of endowed schools are thereby bound to admit to the benefits of the schools the children of Dissenting parents. The friends of religious liberty ought to feel grateful to those who have carried this question through the courts, and especially to Mr. Baker,* who argued the case with much zeal and ability.

Poems. By L. First, Second and Third Series. London—Whitfield.
Poems. By Linus.

It is not in our power to keep pace with all even of the religious poetry which now issues from the press, or we should have ere this mentioned with gentle praise these three modest little volumes of L. The sentiments are always pleasing, and the versification is smooth. Now and then there is poetical fire, and our authoress (for we think L. is of the gentler sex) gains power with increased experience.

The volume which bears the name of "Linus" has some fine thoughts set forth in smooth and pleasant lines. Occasionally we fail to catch the poet's intended idea, but there is no objection of this kind to be made to "The Last of the Twelve:"

> "The Church's door was open'd wide;
> In stream'd the golden eventide;
> And radiant in the clear light bands,
> And o'er the shadows on the floor,
> Two holy men with reverent hands
> The last Apostle bore.
> The Fathers of the Church stood there,
> Bending with reverential air
> Before the Bearer of the Word,
> That old man of a hundred years,
> The living Witness of their Lord,
> The last one left of all his peers.
> This was the Gospel that they heard,
> In tones of a fond *elder* brother:
> 'My little children, love each other!'

---

* On this point we must refer to an advertisement, which our readers will find in another part of the Christian Reformer.

"So, week by week, each Sabbath-day
The Elders met to preach and pray;
And still within the fading light
The faithful ones their burthen bore,
And placed him in the Church's sight
Upon the hallow'd floor;
His long white beard upon his breast,
His quiet, folded hands at rest;
The sacred Past seemed then so nigh,—
The kiss of Jesus,—the last look
From the high cross of Calvary,—
The blessing, when the Father took
The holy One. With trembling sigh,
He spoke like a departing mother:
'My little children, love each other!'

"'O thou, as wondrous as divine,
Whose century has set its sign
Upon thy heaven-directed eye,
Upon thy consecrated brow,
So surely for eternity,—
Thou, who art wearing now
The golden frontlet of the first
High-priest of the new faith we nurs'd!
Hast thou no other, higher word,
No nobler Gospel? This one tires.'
The waning, weary life is stirr'd,
And quickened to its old desires;
The Saint pleads for the risen Lord:
'"Tis Christ's command: 'Love one another:'
Do this, and you shall need no other.'"

A Grammar of the Puk'hto, Pus'hto, or Language of the Afghans, &c. By Captain H. G. Raverty, H. M.'s Third Regiment, Bombay, N. I. 2nd edition. 4to. Pp. 204. London—Longman. 1860.

Our brave soldiers do good service to their country when they improve their opportunities of studying the language, literature and manners of the tribes among whom they are called to serve. Captain Raverty has done good work of this kind in several publications of high rank in oriental literature.

There is special interest attaching to the Pus'hto language, as the people who speak it are conjectured to be of Hebrew origin. Captain Raverty (as did Sir Wm. Jones) is not disposed to dispute this opinion on grounds connected with the language.

But our motive for mentioning this book is that we may quote a passage containing a most painfully startling statement respecting the current translation of the New Testament into the language of the *Afghans*. In a note at p. 34, Captain Raverty says:

"The so-called translation into *Pus'hto* of the New Testament, made by the Serampore missionaries, in 1818, bears a very slight resemblance to the Sacred Writings; in fact, it is quite painful to read. I will merely give one specimen —the well-known verse from the Sermon on the Mount. *'Judge not, that ye be not judged.'* The *Pus'hto* is in the following terms: *'Do not justice unto any one, lest justice shall be done unto you'!* Is this Christian doctrine? Verily, if Christians are to judge of our religion from such translations as this,

it is not to be wondered at that they should scoff at it, hold our faith in ridicule, and call us Kafirs or blasphemers. It is quite evident that, in making this translation, the English has merely been transposed for the *Pus'hto*, without the slightest consideration as to difference of idiom, style and arrangement of the languages. I trust the other translations of the Scriptures are better than the *Pus'hto* one, which is the most ridiculous thing I have ever met with."

It is sad to think that the inevitable difficulties and embarrassments of translating our Scriptures into the languages and dialects of the East, have been increased by the incompetency and ignorance of the men who have undertaken the difficult task.

Remembered Words from the Sermons of Rev. J. Nichols, late Pastor of the First Parish in Portland, Maine. Small 4to. Pp. 141. Boston, U.S.—Crosby and Co. 1860.

This is a beautiful volume alike in type and matter. The words remembered are chiefly memorable passages in the sermons of Mr. Nichols, written down at different times by different persons from recollection. A gentle, trusting piety pervades these *memorabilia*. Many of them shine like gems and are set in excellent taste. We will string together half-a-dozen of the smallest, picking them up almost at random:

"There is a peculiar solemnity in going out alone by the still sea of a mighty truth, like a midnight walk by the side of the ocean."

"There is no ignorance like omission of duty. There is no knowledge like the practice of it."

"True work is hard. Hard: yes; but a particle of its diamond hardness is nobler than all the soft materials of earth's low pleasures."

"Moral effort is the necessary signature of the true Christian character."

"Would we see the depths of the ocean, we must calm the rufflings upon the surface."

"March up to grand and mighty principles, and leave little by-way calculations out of sight."

Home and College. A Public Address delivered in the Hall of the Massachusetts House of Representatives, March 8, 1860. By F. D. Huntington, Preacher to the University, &c. Boston—Crosby and Co. Small 8vo. Pp. 70. 1860.

Mr. Huntington has with no gentle hand recently broken the cords of sympathy between himself as a preacher and those who still see reason for adhering to the special religious faith he once professsd. We rejoice, on meeting him on a different platform, to find that here at least we are heartily at one with him, and to know that, however unsatisfactory his defences from the pulpit of his new orthodoxy are, his harangue from the rostra in the Hall at Boston is instructive and interesting to the least orthodox of his readers. With much wisdom, kind feeling and delicate tact, he discusses the mutual relations of the youth's home and his college. He teaches parents that their antecedent duties to their sons must be faithfully performed, if those sons are to find in the college a place of moral safety and progressive intellectual culture. Admirable are all the remarks of the orator on the home training; not less so those which relate to the college training which succeeds, and

the appeals to the moral sense and intellectual ambition of the student himself. The latter and larger portion of Mr. Huntington's Address discusses the characteristic features of college experience, both as presenting points of peril and conditions of success. With equal courage and wisdom he speaks of the control of the passions, of academical insubordination, of self-respect, of emulative ambition, of the passion for popularity, of kindliness of heart, and the student's religious reverence and faith. From each of these heads of his discourse we could advantageously quote.

We learn from a passage in this Address that, like our own Oxford and Cambridge, Harvard has its practical jokes and its slang.

"Let me tell you a story, not vouching for its particulars, but as it was told to me. You all know what 'hazing' is,—and how threadbare and flat its ever repeated acts of silly violence have come to be. They say that not long ago some Sophomores, of better purpose and more humour than some of their predecessors, heard that two Freshmen in their building were fighting poverty for an education. One cold winter night, rapping loudly at their door, the Sophomores called them up, ordered them to dress, and led them upstairs blindfold to a distant room. Leaving them there for their comrades to entertain, they then returned to the bare and empty room, spread a comfortable carpet over the floor, packed the closet full of fuel, built a roaring fire in the grate, made things generally cheerful, led back the bewildered Freshmen to their own door, shoved them in, and bade them good-night. This is 'hazing' gone philanthropic. A very few such spirited jets of good feeling would revolutionize the stupidest custom that disgraces us. I have made no inquiry; but nobody here will doubt that the prophecy of this little gospel might have been easily traced in two or three cheerful, kindly, charitable homes. God multiply them!

"Seek out the families where the children are suffered to plague each other, to impose on the younger, to despotize over timid servants, or to vex animals and murder insects, and you will be sure to find the material that will stock a University with brutes. Seek the homes of happy, free-hearted charity, and you will find the antidote that will at last turn brutality itself into goodness. For, remember, in this as in other respects we have noticed, it is not the ascetic, forbidding discipline, not the gloomy or sharp-strung households, that send us the right trusty hearts and consciences. These only prepare a reaction, and let their children loose, when they send them from home, into the wild excesses of licence."—Pp. 54—57.

The Rational Primer, or First Reader. By John R. Reard, D.D. Small 8vo. Pp. 171. Manchester. 1860.

This little book is designed as a practical answer to the question, "How can I learn to read?" by a method which aims to combine attractiveness with useful instruction, and to form a storehouse of popular wisdom. It may be safely and advantageously used by all teachers in elementary schools, and is well deserving of the attention of those who instruct the lowest classes in our Sunday-schools. It is strange how few good reading-books there are for such classes. This is certainly one of the few.

INTELLIGENCE.

UPPERTHORPE UNITARIAN CHAPEL.

It is with sincere pleasure we learn that the zealous labours of our friends at Sheffield, under the guidance of Rev. Brooke Herford, are producing important results. We reprint from the *Sheffield Independent* the following account of the proceedings on laying the foundation-stone of a second Unitarian chapel in the town.

The interesting ceremony of laying the foundation-stone of a new Unitarian chapel at Upperthorpe took place on Monday, Oct. 15. There was a numerous assembly, including the principal members of the denomination in the town and neighbourhood. Happily the weather, which had been very bad in the morning, cleared up to some extent during the ceremony. The chapel, which is situated at the bottom of the Crookes Road, will be a plain building in the Early English style, with a triple window in front and an open projecting porch, with ornamental Norman arch and niche. It is calculated to seat 550 persons, and the cost will be about £1400, nearly the whole of which has been subscribed. Sufficient land has been leased to admit of the erection of schools adjoining the chapel at some future time. Mr. Frith is the architect, and Mr. Pearson the contractor for the erection of the building. The proceedings were commenced by the singing of a hymn, after which

Rev. J. Page Hopps said he wished to say a few words to explain what they meant by laying this foundation. They had come into that neighbourhood to do the work, because they believed that wherever men and women congregate, there ought to be a church of Jesus Christ for the worship of God; and as there was no place of worship in the neighbourhood, they had thought they could not do better than go there. This was to be a Christian church, built for the worship of the one true, living God, our Heavenly Father, and to the praise of Jesus Christ, our Saviour. But besides building the chapel for the purposes of worship, they had a great many other things to do—a great many good works to perform. He hoped the persons who lived around would not only go to the chapel to sing hymns and hear sermons, but also to help in many a good word and work. They wanted to teach the children, and to have institutions for the benefit of the working people, so that the church might be the centre for every good work to which they could lay their hands. When the place was opened, and they found anything wanting doing, they would be ready to do it, whatever it might be. The stone bore the text, "Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ." If it were asked what they believed, he replied, "We believe in Jesus Christ;" if it were asked in whom they trusted, he replied, "We trust in Jesus Christ." They felt him to be the purest and noblest and best that ever blessed this poor world, and therefore they put his honoured name upon the corner-stone, and believed it and meant to practise it—in their lives following him, in their hearts loving him, in their words teaching him. This chapel would still stand after all who were now present had passed away; but what they had to do was, to set themselves to find out their work, and having found it, to do it. He had great pleasure in introducing a lady who was too well known to need any praise from him—Miss Shore.

Miss Shore then proceeded to lay the foundation-stone. It bore a cross and the following inscription: "This Corner-stone was laid Oct. 15th, 1860, by Urith Lydia Shore, of Meersbrook. 'Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ.'" The trowel (presented by Mr. Geo. Dalton) and mallet (by Mr. Geo. Eadon) also bore suitable inscriptions. The stone having been lowered into its place, Miss Shore said—My friends, I feel it to be a great privilege to be called upon to aid in the erection of a church to be dedicated to the worship of God, to the honour and reverence of our Saviour, and the promotion of Christian truth. May God enlighten both preachers and hearers to know the truth, and, knowing it, to follow it!

Sir John Bowring said that, on Saturday last, the great *Times* newspaper announced in a leading article, in reference to his connection with the Unitarian body, that Unitarianism was nearly extinct. The presence of that assembly, and the event which was now being celebrated, and the initiative they were about taking, was an emphatic answer to that averment. Unitarianism extinct! No more than were the rolling of the tides or the shining of the sunbeams! The question was not, where Unitarianism is, but where is it not? It had penetrated the Universities; it was heard in the cathedrals; it was represented by the most illustrious men, in some shape or other, of every denomination. It was pervading the world; and whatever might be the differences with respect to other

truths and other doctrines, he ventured to say that the great truths of Unitarianism were recognized in every portion of the Christian world. Happily, Unitarianism was the religion of liberty, the religion of progress. Unitarians feared nothing from, they invited, investigation. They knew that no truth could be imperilled by inquiry, and they themselves would give the example, and encourage others to follow truth wherever it might lead them, and to be sure that the great God of truth, that great benignant Unity, looked with complacency upon all his creatures who were struggling to find their way to Him, who was the great representation of truth, who sat on the throne of truth, and who, for the conveyance and communication of truth to his creatures, sent his chosen messengers, of whom Jesus Christ was the greatest. The great truths of Unitarianism were not only developing themselves amongst Christians, but were also spreading more and more amongst heathen nations. He, as they knew, had been a great traveller, and he had been again and again struck with the sympathy he had found in the enlightened men of many religions with the doctrines which Unitarianism taught. It was impossible to persuade a Brahmin or a Buddhist that a child was born in impurity. They had heard that Jesus Christ blessed little children, and said, "Of such is the kingdom of heaven;" and so let them welcome the child, innocent and pure, the great trust that God had given them, the beginning of man's history, and his end would be universal redemption.

William Fisher, Esq., when called upon, hoped they would excuse him from making a speech, as he was getting too feeble. He expressed his sympathy with the proceedings of that day, but, although he had left the Church of England to become a Unitarian, he had no hostility or animosity to any church. He believed that all would have the blessing of God, whatever their creed or faith or articles, and would ultimately, by His blessing who was universal in his benevolence, be saved.

Rev. Brooke Herford said it was to him a very happy day which witnessed the erection of another Unitarian church in Sheffield, and it was one to which he had long earnestly looked forward. In calling that church "Unitarian," they were not going down there to do any narrow sectarian work, for they did not mean to imply that they were a sect, not because they would not receive into their fellowship men of any or every church, but because there was no other church in the town or neighbourhood which would receive them into its pale, or bid them God-speed as believers in Christ. It was no fault of theirs that they were a sect; but they would fain hope that the day should soon come when men should see that there were things in religion deeper and greater than mere doctrinal differences, and when the churches of Christ would be known not by narrow jealousies, but by the spirit of Christian unity and love in which Christ's church should be one. There was room enough for all. They did not wish to pull down any man's church, or to lessen the numbers attending elsewhere, but they desired to gather in those who went nowhere. They were Unitarians, and taught Unitarianism because they believed it to be the simple truth of the Saviour's doctrine; but they did not strive to build up their church because they thought that it was the only church, but because it was the one in which God had placed them, and which they were to take care of. They did not preach that other men could not be saved, that other men were not Christians as well as themselves; but they acknowledged that, if men in other churches were earnest and true-hearted, read their Bibles and tried to follow Christ, they were as much Christians as the Unitarians were, although each thought the other wrong on some points. The day would come when this spirit would pervade all churches, and mere sectarianism pass away. He prayed that time might come, when even the name Unitarian might be forgotten, not because its doctrines had ceased to be true, but because all churches should come at last to worship the true God, and so the name lose its sectarian meaning. He hoped that church would be instrumental in doing a great work there.

Another hymn (written for the occasion by Rev. J. Page Hopps) having been sung and prayer offered, the assembly separated.

The event of the day was celebrated by a soirée of a very brilliant character in the Cutlers' Hall, under the presidency of the Master Cutler. There were between 500 and 600 guests. Excellent speeches were made by the Master Cutler, Mr. Alderman Jackson, Mr. Offley Shore, Mr. Jessop, Mr. Bramley, Sir John Bowring, Mr. F. Morton, Rev. F. Bishop, Rev. M. A. Moon, Mr. Hobson, Rev. Brooke Herford, Rev. J. P. Hopps, Rev. P. W. Clayden, &c. We wish our space permitted us to report much of what was said and done on this interesting occasion.

LOWER MOSLEY STREET, MANCHESTER.

On Monday evening, October 15th, the half-yearly meeting of *parents* took place in the Lower Mosley-Street Sunday-school. Nearly 300 persons attended, and sat down

together to a substantial tea provided under the superintendence of the teachers. The people present seemed to have been collected from all parts of the city, and from their large numbers afforded an interesting proof of the value which was set upon the instruction imparted to their children. After tea, a meeting took place in the upper room, which was speedily filled by an attentive audience. The Rev. J. Drummond took the chair and made some appropriate remarks upon Christian charity. He then called upon the Rev. J. C. Street, who spoke earnestly to the parents concerning the necessity of a constant preparation for the "life everlasting," and urged upon them to be good and holy examples to their children. The Rev. E. Smith then, by illustration and argument, enforced the need of perseverance. Dr. Marcus gave an interesting sketch of the operations of the school, with especial reference to the week-evening classes; and Mr. Geo. Smith pointed out some of the special failings of children, and made some practical suggestions for their removal. The proceedings of the evening were agreeably varied by singing and recitations, which were exceedingly creditable to the young men and women who took part therein. The evening hymn and a vote of thanks to the Chairman terminated the evening's proceedings at about ten o'clock. In looking back upon the many interesting meetings of a similar character which have been held in connection with the Lower Mosley-Street schools, it is impossible to avoid the conclusion that they are of singular value in bringing parents and teachers together, and in making them mutually interested in their important duties. It would be well if such meetings were more common in connection with our Sunday-schools, for they would both directly and indirectly result in strengthening the hands of the teachers and in awakening the interest of the parents. We commend them to the serious attention of the managers of Sunday-schools.

MISSION CHAPEL, ROCHDALE ROAD, MANCHESTER.

The working of our Unitarian Domestic Missions shews that common-sense views of religion and the Bible, as represented in Unitarian Christianity, are well adapted to the mental capacities and spiritual requirements of intelligent working men. The domestic missionaries at Manchester and other places are carrying on their good work. Chapel services on Sundays and other days, week-evening lectures, popular and innocent entertainments, temperance meetings, mutual-improvement and singing classes, Sunday and day schools, boys' and girls' classes for writing and reading, and also the young women's class during the evenings for the same purpose, the Sunday-school benefit society, and other excellent schemes for doing good, such as the library and distribution of tracts, are in active operation at the Mission chapel, in the Rochdale Road, under the care of Mr. E. W. Hopkinson.

On Monday evening, Oct. 8th, a half-yearly congregational meeting was held in the school-room beneath the chapel. A numerous and cheerful party assembled around the social board. After a simple but abundant repast, a hymn was sung; and Mr. Hopkinson was called to the chair. In his opening address, he set before his hearers the loveliness of that divine and unsectarian Christianity which opens its expansive arms of universal charity to embrace the whole family of man, and especially the humble poor. The Revds. J. C. Street and C. C. Nutter, with Mr. Shawcross, of the Parent Committee, were also present and took part in the proceedings. The Rev. C. C. Nutter explained how Christianity, rightly interpreted and understood, must be adapted to the circumstances and wants of working men and women. He referred to the circumstance that early Christianity was promoted by the sympathy and aid of pious women, and urged upon all, both male and female, the necessity and duty of faithful and earnest work, and counselled them to pursue with zeal and perseverance every good and beneficent agency upon which they had entered, and not to let their hands tire or their feet falter in the path of well-doing.

Mr. Shawcross expressed the great interest he had always felt in the success of their mission. He had never seen the institution in so efficient a condition as at present, and this he attributed to the labours of their minister and his coadjutors. His sympathies were quite in harmony with the Chairman's remarks on Christian charity, and yet, at the same time, he was of opinion that we ought not to overlook or forget the importance of a conscientious regard to what each individual after patient investigation has embraced as being to him the truth. He was an advocate for perfect freedom of opinion, combined with perfect charity towards all and for all. He shewed the application of these principles to the present condition of thought and feeling among the people.

Rev. J. C. Street, in addressing the meeting, commenced with some observations upon true Christian charity, in which he quoted the words of the great Swedish

theologian, Baron Swedenborg, that "in the spiritual world, into which every man goes after death, it is not asked, what has your faith been, or what your creed? but what has your life been?" and, further, "that all religion has relation to life, and the life of religion is to do good." He then remarked on the aggressive character of Christianity, and in doing this he took occasion to animadvert upon an opinion sometimes expressed by Unitarians, which seemed to intimate that their ministers ought not to go out into the highways and streets to preach to the people. He spoke on some of the moral aspects presented in popular cities and towns where there were large aggregations of wealth in the hands of the few, and where vast numbers of the labouring classes were necessarily thrown together. The opulent classes could build churches and chapels, and maintain services suited to their wants and tastes, but few of the working men with their wives and families entered them. He did not say that the poor were not wanted there, for it was the boast of Christianity, and not least so of Unitarian Christianity, that it was specially adapted to the poor; but the fact remained indubitable that they were not to be found there. The great majority of the people in large cities were neither directly nor indirectly connected with any section of the Christian church, and the working men who were around him could abundantly bear testimony to that fact. While Christians were content with merely a settled ministry, the duty of which was to preach Sunday after Sunday to the same or nearly the same hearers, the outlying masses of the people would never be reached. There was need of a special agency to carry Christianity to the people, an aggressive ministry, carefully prepared by a large and liberal education, and by a healthy development of generous and noble sympathies. Mr. Street then referred to an opinion which some persons seem to entertain, that any man, provided he had the "right spirit" and his "heart was in the work," was qualified for such a ministry. There never was a greater mistake. Many of the sceptical among the working classes had made themselves much better acquainted with the grounds of their unbelief than had numbers of nominal Christians with the reasons for their faith; and it was not difficult to see, if a controversy arose under such circumstances, on which side the victory would be proclaimed by those whose prejudices were already enlisted in favour of unbelief. Such men had to be confronted at every step. Then, again, in addition to all this, there were all the varieties of vice and misery which were engendered in a thick population, whose wits were sharpened by a struggle for daily bread, and whose tastes and habits were vitiated by the allurements and temptations which abounded on every side. A ministry suited to meet these various requirements would need to be furnished with every weapon from the Christian armoury. With the sword of the spirit in their hands, these men were to shew that, though Christianity was a religion of peace and contemplated that as an ultimate good, it nevertheless was an uncompromising foe of evil, and sought the destruction of evil on every hand. It was a good sign that domestic missions and missionary associations were being established, but they wanted a larger and more generous support, and ought to be multiplied in number and augmented in efficiency. Mr. Street concluded his speech with an earnest appeal to Unitarians to avail themselves of the glorious opportunities now presented to them, and to prove themselves worthy of their position and the important trust committed to them.

Mr. Lowe referred to the mispresentations by orthodox missionaries.

Mr. Jones observed that "the fields were white already to the harvest," that Unitarians never had so grand an opportunity as now, and that from his personal acquaintance with the working class he was persuaded that the intelligent portion of them could be reached by no other means than through Unitarian Christianity.

This useful meeting was brought to a close in the usual way about ten o'clock.

UNITARIANISM IN THE NORTH OF ENGLAND.

During the last three years our churches in the North of England, from York to Newcastle, including Stockton and Sunderland, have experienced trying changes. They have passed through a period which has proved that the principles of our holy faith are not entirely dependent for their life and growth on the eloquence of one or the learning of another; that God's truth, with the maintenance of which we are charged, survives all the changes and shocks to which the mortal race, however distinguished or revered, are subject. The ministers of all these churches have been removed to different spheres of labour and some to heaven during this short period; and could we have seen this *solitary fact* of removal and loss three years ago, our doubting hearts might have paled before it. We are glad to inform our readers that Unitarianism in the North of England never seemed to hold on its way so prosperously as at the present time. Our

church at York has steadily increased in number since the settlement of the Rev. G. Vance Smith in that city. At present the church building of St. Saviourgate is undergoing a thorough renovation, and will be re-opened in the course of a month or two. The services are being held in one of the public halls of York.—The whole of our readers will be glad to hear that the beautiful church of the Divine Unity at Newcastle-on-Tyne, which lost the able and faithful services of the Rev. George Harris by death, is now again well attended, under the ministry of the Rev. W. Newton, late of Hinckley, and that the people more and more appreciate his services and express their profit under his ministration. This church has also been well cleaned, and the painted portions of it re-painted and beautified, and all is going on prosperously and pleasantly among them. We know this to be true, and that it will cheer the hearts of many of the friends of the late pastor.—Our church at Stockton-on-Tees is in a very prosperous condition: the number of seat-holders has very considerably increased. The congregation in a usual way almost fill the building, which has also been renovated during the last two years at considerable expense. Our Stockton friends are a fair pattern of what all our members should be in their attendance on worship everywhere. Almost the whole who make profession of our faith in that town are most regular in their attendance every Sabbath-day on the services of the chapel. Morning and evening the chapel is nearly filled.—Sunderland, the most recent of our Unitarian churches in the North, has had its severe struggles during the thirty years of its being. Some of those who struggled long and well in this town to establish Christian Unitarian worship went to their reward almost hopeless, at least fearing they had laboured in vain.

But we learn from the *Sunderland Times* that another effort is about to be made to establish Unitarian Christianity in that town. On Sunday, October 21, a public recognition service took place in the Unitarian chapel there, on the commencement of the ministry of Rev. A. Macdonald, M.A. In the morning, that gentleman preached from Job xxxii. 7; and in the evening, the Rev. Wm. Newton, minister of the Church of the Divine Unity, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, preached from the parable of the Sower.

On Monday night, a tea-meeting and soirée was held in the Central Hall, John Street, at which nearly 300 persons were present. The whole of the tables, eleven in number, were gratuitously supplied and presided over by the ladies of the congregation.

Rev. Mr. Spears, of Stockton, formerly minister at Sunderland, having been called to the chair, delivered an interesting address. After referring to the peculiar pleasure he felt in presiding, arising from his previous connection with the congregation, and the kind feeling which they had always shewn towards him, he sketched the struggles which they had experienced as a church, and contrasted the cheering aspects of the present with the discouraging circumstances of past though but recent days. The present meeting, he said, was the largest and most satisfactory they had ever held in Sunderland. There was, however, a danger of being unduly elated in prosperity, and he trusted that they would bear themselves as worthily in their improved position as they had struggled manfully under adverse circumstances. After some observations on the importance and responsibility of the ministerial office, he gave the right hand of fellowship to their chosen minister, Mr. Macdonald.

Mr. Gammage then presented an address on behalf of the church of Sunderland, inviting the Rev. A. Macdonald to become their permanent minister. In presenting the address, he warmly eulogized the liberal and disinterested spirit Mr. Macdonald had shewn in becoming the minister of the congregation.

Rev. Mr. Macdonald eloquently acknowledged the address. He would engage to do his best in the performance of the work assigned to him. There was much ground for encouragement. Their numbers were increasing, and he hoped the increase would soon reach a hundredfold. He had received a letter from Henry King Sparks, Esq., of Darlington, stating that he would have been glad to be present on that occasion, and assuring them of his sympathy with the cause in which they were engaged, enclosing a contribution of £5.

The meeting was subsequently addressed by the Rev. W. Newton, of Newcastle, Mr. Lucas, of Gateshead, Mr. John Wright, and several other friends.

TRANSYLVANIAN CHURCH AND STUDENTS.

The first Unitarian student from Transylvania has reached this country, and will, as soon as his familiarity with the English language enables him to do so with advantage (probably at Christmas), enter some of the classes at Manchester New College. His name is Dominick Simén; he is the son of a Transylvanian Unitarian clergyman, and is himself ordained to the ministry. The Sub-committee of the British

and Foreign Unitarian Association who have in charge the department of Transylvanian affairs, have succeeded in placing him in the family of Rev. T. L. Marshall. Next year Mr. Simén will probably be joined by a second student from Transylvania. The brightening prospects of Hungary in respect to constitutional liberty give increased importance to this part of the working of the plans of the Unitarian Association. Who can measure the advantage of a succession of liberal clergymen in Transylvania familiar with the working of English institutions, and carrying into the heart of their country the spirit of liberty and self-government so dear to Englishmen? We would remind our Unitarian friends at home that the British and Foreign Unitarian Association has undertaken new responsibilities in this matter in reliance on the general support of the body. It will help to shew to our readers what great importance is attached at Klausenburg to the reception and education of the Transylvanian students, if we print an address from the Consistory, of which Mr. Simén was the bearer:

"To the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, from the Consistory of the Unitarians in Transylvania.

"Dear Brethren in Christ,—We hail with a feeling of deep satisfaction the new link of connection which you have enabled us to form by assisting us in the maintenance of one of our students at the Manchester College in London. That sympathy which has so long existed between us on the ground of our common faith, and which you have lately so generously expressed not in words only but in deeds, will, we earnestly believe, be now placed on a firm and permanent basis, and we thank God for this new means of a closer connection between the Unitarians of England and of Transylvania. You may be assured that, firmly attached as we are to the truths of our faith, to the principles taught by Jesus Christ in the Scriptures, we rejoice in an opportunity like the present, by which we hope to see these truths and principles forwarded.

"The name of the young student who is the bearer of our present recommendation, and who is about to join your College, is Mr. Domokos Simén. May God grant that he shall spend his time there to his own profit and your satisfaction, and he may return to this country enriched with the knowledge of religious truth, and so be once a worthy labourer in the vineyard of our Master! We believe the best way in which he can express his thanks for your generous sacrifices in his behalf, is by appropriating the English modes of feeling and thinking, and by engrafting them on the native Hungarian character. That he may so be fit to work with zeal and success, and by preaching and promoting the truths of the Unitarian faith may shew himself in his works a true servant of the Lord. We recommend him.

"We cannot let this opportunity pass without thanking you for books you sent us through Mr. Paget for our library. Literature, especially theological literature, is very confined in our country, and we daily feel a greater necessity for expressing our religious ideas in words; and in the books which we have received from you we find new sources opened, from which minds eager for theological science may seek sweet nourishment.

"At the same time, we are happy to express our thanks to the respected Secretary of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, the Rev. Mr. Aspland, who has shewn so much sympathy, so much generous feeling towards the Unitarians of Transylvania, for the pleasure he has offered us in sending us the portrait of the late Rev. Mr. Wellbeloved. God bless him and the labours of the Association!

"May God be with you and with us!

"Moses Szekely, Consistorii Unitariorum Præses. et Superintendentis Locum tenens.

"Moses Papmpr, Secretary.

"Klausenbourg, Sept. 16th, 1860."

DR. CUMMING'S PROPHETIC "TRIBULATION" TRASH.

The productions of Dr. Cumming might, so far as they influence (we will not say scholars, but) persons of moderate information and common sense, be safely left to that silence which in some cases is the best rebuke; but as, in matters bearing on theology and Scripture interpretation, knowledge and common sense are not the property of the multitude, it is well that now and then a voice should be raised to warn the people against trusting in popular theological and pulpit quacks, who are as heedless of their statements as the charlatans who vend their nostrums to the gaping crowds on Tower Hill and at Smithfield. We are glad to see that a friend and esteemed correspondent has executed the needful though distasteful task of exposing Dr. Cumming's misstatements; and we reprint his letter from the *Birmingham Daily Post* of Oct. 24, as an encouragement to other friends, qualified for the task, to do something to enlighten the people on subjects on which they are by many professed teachers grossly deceived.

Dr. Cumming on Public Affairs.

Sir,—In your *Daily Post* of Friday, October 12th, you give, under the above title, a report of a lecture delivered by Dr. Cumming, at Manchester, on "The Destiny of England in the Prophetic Records."

As one who cherishes an unfeigned reverence for the Holy Bible as containing the records of a divine revelation, I am both grieved and shocked by the ignorant presumption of men who use it as a kind of "Sortes Virgilianæ" (Book of Fate), and search among its sublime disclosures of religious truth, and in the history of the people to and through whom these disclosures have been chiefly made, for mystic foreshadowings of the destiny of modern nations and potentates, which it is assumed that the Omniscient God has therein manifested to exercise the ingenuity of our modern interpreters and politicians; in both of which characters, Dr. Cumming appeals to the English public on the present and immediately prospective state of our affairs. Anything more foolish and fanatical than Dr. Cumming's exposition of scripture I have seldom met with; and the applause with which he is stated to have been received by an assembly of professing Christians, is almost enough to make one despair of ever obtaining a hearing for "the things which become sound doctrine," and fair interpretation, and common sense. However, I will not despair; but in this town, in which I am personally known to many, I will endeavour to expose the foolishness of Dr. Cumming's interpretations; not by an appeal to "every published dictionary," after his own grandiloquent fashion (for I know that I have not access to "every published dictionary," nor do I believe that he has, or could use it if he had, notwithstanding his boast)—but by specific reference to learned interpreters whom I will mention by name, and whose names will justly carry weight with every man who is in the least conversant with biblical criticism, though it would not at all surprise me to find that Dr. Cumming knows little or nothing about them.

I confine my remarks to two words which Dr. Cumming has the audacity to interpret,—the one "steam-ships" or "steam-boats," the other "steam-carriages;" and these remarks shall be as brief as possible. I deny, absolutely and unequivocally, the correctness of both these interpretations; and can only see in them an evidence of Dr. Cumming's own ignorance, or of his calculating largely on the ignorance and credulity of his audience.

1. As to "steam-ships" or "steam-boats." This is Dr. Cumming's burlesque interpretation of the original in Isaiah xviii. 2, which means "boats made of papyrus or bulrushes." Bulrushes are marsh or river plants, and are therefore very naturally designated in Hebrew by a word which means "an absorbent of water." This is the explanation given by Buxtorf and Simon in their respective Hebrew Lexicons, and by Rosenmüller in his Scholia in Vetus Testamentum, 2nda ed., Lipsiæ, 1820; the latter of whom refers to Pliny for a description of these very boats. I have read the description, and there is not a word in it which even the most perverse ingenuity could twist into a prophetic anticipation of Fulton's wonderful invention; but because both bulrushes and steam-boats have to do with water, Dr. Cumming argues that they are identical. Just as easy would it be (writes a contemporary in the *Critic*), if we might "interpret Scripture *à la* Cumming, to shew that the Doctor himself is the beast with seven heads, or Balaam's ass."

2. As to "the steam-carriage or railroad," which is Dr. Cumming's equally burlesque interpretation of what our more careful and modest translators have rendered "swift beasts" (Isaiah lxvi. 20). The original word is derived from a verb which means *to jump or leap;* and possibly, therefore, Dr. Cumming's interpretation may have been ironically designed as involving a prophetic imprecation on all such steam-carriages or railroads as are ill-laid or out of order, in consequence of which the carriages *leap* or *jump*, instead of going smoothly on their rails as they ought to do. But what would be a great fault in a railroad, or its carriages and engines, is no fault at all, but the very reverse, in that swift beast of the desert, whose natural and rapid mode of progression, which (says Simon) the French call *galop*—(in English *gallop*)—this original word most truly and graphically describes. The authorities, therefore, whom I have already cited, in concurrence with those other illustrious scripture critics, Bochart (Hierozöikon, tom. 1, p. 24, Lipsiæ, 1793) and Schultens, as quoted by Rosenmüller in his Scholia, justly render this word "dromedaries;" the camel or dromedary being one of the commonest beasts of transport employed in the East, and not likely, therefore, to have been omitted in an enumeration of various modes of transport which would be used in bringing back the Jewish exiles from Babylon "to my holy mountain Jerusalem."

I call upon Dr. Cumming to give as clear a reference as either of the foregoing to any one of the works which he professes to have examined, in confirmation of his

reported assertion that the word which I have translated *dromedaries* "literally signifies *a machine turning round with great swiftness.*" I have been unable myself to discover any such interpretation, and must continue to demur to its correctness until Dr. Cumming has produced at least plausible authority for it.

I ask, in conclusion, with the contemporary writer already quoted, "Can impudence and credulity go further?—impudence on the part of the speaker who dares talk such profane nonsense, and credulity on the part of the audience who can listen to it with applause?" I trust that there are some, at least, in Birmingham, who will sternly denounce with me both the impudence and the credulity by which Divine Revelation and its sacred records are thus travestied and profaned.

Respectfully yours,

SAMUEL BACHE,

Minister of the Congregation assembling in the New Meeting-house, Birmingham.

Edgbaston, October 22nd, 1860.

A RE-CONVERSION.

The Rev. C. H. Dall has sent us for publication a letter from Mr. W. Roberts, the Unitarian missionary at Madras, from which we print some extracts that are interesting as shewing the distinctive influence on Christian faith of some orthodox doctrines, and the necessity of Unitarianism for the successful defence of Christianity against Mahomedans and others. Mr. Roberts's letter is dated June 22nd.

"Mr. Edwin Rose, a European, who was employed in the railway as an engineer, not being satisfied with the doctrine of the Trinity, became a Mahomedan, and was named Mahommed Abdool Ady. I wished to see him, and obtained a letter from Khyroodean Khan to permit me to see the convert to Mahomedanism, who resided at one Fackeer Saib's house. The letter which was given to me was as follows: 'The bearer of this is a missionary; desires to see Abdool Ady: trust you will convert him also to our holy religion.' By means of this letter I saw Abdool Ady and another European convert to Mahomedanism on the 11th. I wished to know his reasons for embracing Mahomedanism. He made some remarks regarding the Athanasian Creed, the doctrine of the Trinity, &c. I mentioned some passages from Scripture which clearly confirm the unity of God; and then he began to talk about the missionaries who say that Christ is co-equal, co-eternal with the Father. I said that Christ disclaims all equality with the Father, and quoted some passages from Scripture, such as, 'My Father is greater than I,' 'Call no man your Father on earth,' &c.; and told him that the Athanasian Creed itself contradicts the idea of Christ being equal with the Father, and mentioned to him that place where it is said that the 'Father is unbegotten,' but regarding the Son, that he is 'begotten by the Father;' and mentioned some other passages also from Scripture, which convinced him that our blessed Lord Jesus is neither independent of the Father nor equal to Him. Afterwards he began to speak about the Comforter. His mind was entirely settled when I stated that the Comforter was promised to the disciples of Christ, and that they were directed to remain at Jerusalem till they should receive the Comforter, the spirit of truth. I informed him that the Holy Spirit is the power, energy and blessing of God; and then he wanted to know what was my opinion regarding Mahomed, since he had so widely spread the doctrine of the unity of God. I answered that I thought he understood on this point the Bible better than all Trinitarians and Roman Catholics; but as for virtue and morality, he was not a fit person to be imitated, and gave my reasons for the same. Abdool Ady was very much pleased with my conversation, and requested me to call over again on the 16th. I met them in the same place on the evening of the 16th. After speaking a little while on various subjects, they promised to call at our chapel the next day. I could find none but my dear boy Samuel to have the courage to go to a Mahomedan's house to bring them to our chapel. On the next day (Sunday) Samuel went and hired a conveyance and brought them both to the chapel. The lessons were on that date as follows: Psalms lxxxv. and lxxxvi., Deut. xxxii., John xvi. The text for my sermon was Rev. xiv. 4, 'These are they who follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth.' Subject, 'True Christian Followers of the Lamb.' This is the first English sermon that I ever delivered in our chapel. After sermon, I prepared something for their refreshment; even for a glass of water I had to pay something. In the afternoon I again provided them with a conveyance to take them back. I am glad to state that, by the power and blessing of God, Abdool Ady repented his folly of embracing Mahomedanism, quitted Fackeer Saib's house the next day, gave up his Mahomedan name and doctrine, changed his dress, assumed his former name, Mr. Edwin Rose. Under Unitarian Christian principles, may God bless and prolong his days!"

A SCHOOL FESTIVAL.

On Thursday evening, Oct. 25th, the friends and supporters of the Day and Sunday school connected with the Unitarian church, Hackney, assembled in considerable numbers to assist in a school festival. After tea, the children were ushered into the large school-room, where an Autumnal Tree, richly and tastefully decorated, greeted their view, and beneath and around it was a profusion of gifts of a useful and ornamental kind. It took more than two hours to distribute all the presents. This was done by the pastor of the congregation, assisted by the lady teachers of the Sunday-school. The friends of the school marked their appreciation of the services (of twenty years' continuance) of the governess, Miss Johnson, by presenting her with a time-piece, a work-box, a handsome copy of Longfellow's Poems, and other presents. The proceedings from first to last gave unbounded pleasure to the children, and were, we believe, interesting to all present.

MINISTERIAL CHANGES.

Dr. Harrison has resigned the pulpit at Effra Road, Brixton, and his resignation has been accepted by the Committee. No successor is as yet appointed; but we understand that the Committee will be happy to receive communications from ministers willing to supply the vacancy, and that they may address their communications to David Martineau, Esq., South Road, Clapham Park, S.

Rev. G. B. Brock, of Exeter, has accepted an invitation from the united congregations of Altringham and Hale, in Cheshire, and will enter on his duties there at Lady-day.

Rev. John Thomas, B.A., whose secession from the Church of England we lately mentioned, has accepted an invitation to become the pastor of the Unitarian congregation at Dudley, and has already entered on his duties there, succeeding Rev. Dr. Sam. Davison, who is, we believe, desirous of forming another pastoral engagement.

Rev. G. Heaviside, B.A., late of Manchester New College, has entered on his ministerial duties at Coventry.

Rev. Percy Bakewell, B.A., late of Manchester New College, has entered on his pastoral duties at Northampton.

Rev. R. Simpson, B.A., late of Cambridge and Manchester New College, has commenced his ministry at Horsham.

UNITARIAN MISSION CHAPEL AT HEYWOOD, LANCASHIRE.

This chapel, a kind of first fruits in Lancashire of the newly-developed missionary spirit, is to be opened by Rev. W. H. Channing on Thursday, Nov. 15th. The fact of a congregation being gathered and a chapel built in a township in which half-a-dozen years ago there was not probably a single Unitarian, shews what may be done by missionary zeal directed to the diffusion of a system of faith which is at once rational and scriptural. We are able to announce that the Committee of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association have thought the occasion one that deserves the attendance and aid of a deputation from their body. It is hoped that Mr. David Martineau, Mr. Alfred Lawrence and Mr. J. T. Hart, accompanied by the Secretary, will form the deputation on this occasion. On the following Sunday afternoon and evening, the services will be conducted by Rev. R. Brook Aspland.

OBITUARY.

Sept. 29, at her residence in Upper Rutland Street, Dublin, after an illness of three days, MARTHA BLACKLEY, aged 65 years, youngest daughter of the late Robert Blackley, of the same city. This lady was a zealous and valued member of the Unitarian congregation of Strand Street. Strenuously as she upheld, both by her pen and personal influence, the doctrines which she deemed the highest and purest truth, she proved their ennobling power over her heart and character by her freedom from all narrow sectarian bias, and by her generous efforts in every field to which her benevolence could reach. Her energy in the limited sphere to which circumstances restricted her was unremitting. Personal considerations of convenience, ease, and sometimes even of health, were set aside by her as though they existed not, when there was a question between them and the duties she had marked out for herself in a life whose abundant leisure she filled up with the best work of which her varied gifts were capable. In the schools, especially, connected with the religious society to which she belonged, did she labour for many years with unfailing love and earnestness.

Her ardent poetical temperament, chastened by many a trial from within as well as from without,—her bright intellect en-

riched by liberal culture, consecrated by Christian aspiration,—her gaiety and simplicity,—rendered her a delightful companion; while her ready promptitude to serve and please, her quick sympathy and warm affection, endeared her closely to that circle of tried friends and relatives who must long mourn her sudden removal from among them. They rejoice to believe that the faith by which she lived is now become to her "open vision," and that she may go on from strength to strength in the nearer presence of that Saviour in whom she trusted, and whose "little ones" she so loved for his sake.

Oct. 9, in Gloucester, at an advanced age, after a lingering indisposition, ELIZABETH, the wife of Samuel TAYLOR, Esq. The removal of this exemplary Christian from the world is a source of sincere regret to the members of the circle in which she moved, by whom she was esteemed for her talents and loved for her varied worth. Her survivors, however, find a solace in reflecting on the consistency with which she pursued the even tenor of her course through life, and the serenity with which she surrendered up existence at the command of her gracious Creator. Her active virtues had for many years proved the excellence of the principles she professed and by which she was actuated, whilst her patience and resignation under long protracted illness set the seal to her character. It afforded to all her friends the consolatory assurance that her work was done, her warfare accomplished, and her meetness for a better state complete.

J. G. T.

Oct. 12, at Barnet, SUSAN, the beloved wife of Mr. James Hawkins SAYER, second daughter of Mr. Charles Ellis, Maidstone.

Oct. 21, at Chester, aged 11 years, ELIZABETH MARIA, only daughter of Edward JOHNSON, Esq., of Abbot's Cottage.

At Prescot, aged 45, after a short illness, Mr. SAMUEL CALDWELL PROCTER, the only remaining son and member of the family of the late Rev. William Tulledelph Procter, formerly minister for thirteen years to the Presbyterian congregation assembling for public worship in the chapel situate in Atherton Street.

MARRIAGES.

Sept. 26, by Rev. J. Hamilton Thom, ARTHUR GREG, of Eagley, near Bolton-le-Moors, to MARGARET, eldest daughter of John LEISLER, Esq., of Victoria Park, Manchester.

Sept. 26, at Hampstead church, by Rev. William Dixon, THOMAS DIXON, Esq., of Birmingham, to MARIA LINDSAY, daughter of the late John TRAVERS, Esq., of London.

Sept. 27, at Ruddington, by Rev. C. H. Parker, Rector of Great Comberton, Worcestershire, JOHN WILLIAM MELLOR, of the Inner Temple, barrister-at-law, eldest son of John Mellor, Esq., of the Inner Temple, Q.C., M.P., of Otterspool, in the county of Herts, to CAROLINE, fourth daughter of Charles PAGET, Esq., M.P., of Ruddington Grange, in the county of Notts.

Oct. 11, at the Unitarian chapel, Stockton-on-Tees, by Rev. Robert Spears, Mr. ROBERT C. TALYNTINE, of Newcastle-on-Tyne, to Miss CLEPHAN, of Stockton-on-Tees, daughter of Mr. J. B. Clephan. At the close of the service, Mr. Spears said he had another pleasing duty to perform in the name of the congregation, and that was to present the bride with a Family Bible, and also their collection of Hymns for Home and Church, as a small token of their esteem for the bride, and of gratitude for her kind and valuable services as organist in the chapel; and that this was only a part of the testimonial the congregation would have the pleasure of handing to her to mark the occasion with their goodwill and best wishes.

Oct. 13, at Christchurch chapel, Bridgwater, by Rev. Thomas Holland, B.A., JAMES LOVIBOND to LUCY JANE POLE, both of Bridgwater.

Oct. 16, at the Crook-Street chapel, Chester, by Rev. J. K. Montgomery, WILLIAM MALIN, Esq., of Parkfield, Darley, Derbyshire, to Miss OLIVER, formerly of Derby.

Oct. 17, at the Unitarian church, Newhall Hill, Birmingham, by Mr. John Green, Mr. GEORGE DAVIS, son of Mr. William Davis, of Branston Street, to MARIA SARAH LATHAM, of Lennox Street, Lozells, Aston, daughter of the late Mr. Thomas Latham.

Oct. 18, HORACE FIELD, B.A., architect, Lincoln's Inn Fields, to CHRISTINA, daughter of the late Edward WHITE, of Queen Street, Glasgow.

Oct. 22, at Lord-Street chapel, Oldham, by Rev. C. W. Robberds, RALPH CROMPTON, to MARY ANN MOFFITT. And at the same time and place, STEPHEN BROOKES, to MARY BEESLEY,—all of Oldham.